This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06736517 5

MEMOIRS

OF THE

PRINCE OF WALES.

VOL. II.

MEMOIRS

OF

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS

THE

Prince of Wales.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

"In these unhappy times, the world, Sir, examine the conduct of Princes with a jealous, a scrutinizing, a malignant eye. No man is more aware than I am of the existence of such a disposition, and no man is, therefore, more determined to place himself above all suspicion."

Letter from the Prince of Wales to the King.

VOL. II.

4/

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. F. HUGHES,

BOOKSELLER TO H. R. H. THE PRINCE OF WALES,

No. 15, Paternoster-Row, and 5, Wigmore-Street.
Cavendish-Square.

1808.

MRS

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
5211801
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
B 1950 L

B. CLARKE, Printer, Well-street,
Cripplegate.

MEMOIRS

OF

H. R. H. George Augustus Frederick

PRINCE OF WALES.

CHAPTER I.

VINDICATION OF THE PRINCE OF WALES FOR HIS PATRONAGE OF PUGILISTIC CONTESTS—DISSERTATION ON THE ENGLISH CHARACTER—REMARKS ON THE PRINCE'S CONNECTION WITH THE TURF—THE SPORTS OF RACING DEFENDED—NARRATIVE OF SOME OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS'S SPORTING ENGAGEMENTS—ACCOUNT OF THE JOCKEY CLUB—MISREPRESENTATIONS CORRECTED—DISPUTE RELATIVE TO THE PRINCE'S HORSE ECLIPSE, OCTOBER 20th AND 21st, 1791—CHIFNEY'S ACCOUNT OF THOSE MATCHES—EXAMINATION OF CHIFNEY BEFORE THE JOCKEY CLUB—CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN CHIFNEY AND THE PRINCE OF WALES—TERMINATION OF THE PRINCE'S TURF ENGAGEMENTS—EXCULPATORY AFFIDAVIT OF CHIFNEY—FURTHER VINDICATION OF THE PRINCE OF WALES—REPLY TO VARIOUS CALUMNIES.

WE now come to speak of some transactions in which his royal highness was engaged at this period, and by which he incurred a very considerable, but, in our sincere opinion, wholly unmerited, share of obloquy. We allude to the Prince of Wales's connection with the turf. Athletic sports seem ever to have been favourites with the English nation, and it was no doubt sound policy to encourage them, inasmuch as the safety and independence of a nation must, in a great degree, depend upon the martial spirit and habits of its natives. Our ancestors, in their rude and boisterous sports, seem to have had two objects in view—to season the youth of England to firmness of mind and agility of body, or, in other words, to make them skilful in the science of offence or defence, and intrepid in the encountering

of danger. And it must be confessed, that our national character, from the earliest records of our history, appears to have been admirably calculated to receive impressions of the kind here described. The character of a native Englishman, undebased by any adventitious circumstances, is perhaps the noblest that the present race of men, in any quarter of the globe, can produce. In the hour of danger he is bold, in the moment of victory he is generous and humane. No nation that ever made war so frequently as the English nation could ever boast of such a series of victories, unsullied by any imputations of cruelty, as those that have attended the arms of England in every quarter of the globe. There are undoubtedly unworthy exceptions; but the courage of Englishmen, in general, is unalloyed with any mixture of ferocity, and *in* many instances we

have been at a loss whether most to admire, the invincible resolution or the matchless generosity of our heroes. The sports of England, for the most part, have a tendency to confirm this temper. They are boisterous, it is true, but at the same time admirably calculated to produce a manly and courageous spirit, without permitting the martial emotions to which they give rise to degenerate into cruelty or ferocity. This is exemplified in the contentions of the vulgar, and in our prize-fights. Nothing is allowed to superior strength: the fallen antagonist, in such contests, is protected by a national law of honour (a law peculiar to English combatants) from the attack of his opponent, who, should he ungenerously strike his prostrate and helpless foe, would be sure to call down upon himself the indignation and the *vengeance* of all who beheld him. It

is from this cause that in our prize-fights superior personal strength is so often obliged to yield the palm of victory; and it is from this cause that the feuds of the populace are rarely attended with fatal consequences.

It is a mistaken humanity which would lead us to wish to see abolished the sports of the common people. What should we establish in their stead for the recreation of the hardy peasantry of England? The dancing or the duelling of France; the music-houses of Holland, where liquor and prostitution go hand in hand, and the orgies of the night terminate with a skirmish of knives? or shall we recommend the Russian mode of calling foul names, boxing ears with the flat hand, and pulling of beards, or the still more detestable American fashion, derived certainly not from their Eng*lish ancestors, but* probably borrowed

from their Indian neighbours, of biting or forcing each others eyes out of their sockets? No; let us seek for no such foreign improvements. Let us be contented with those bold, active sports which our ancestors provided for us, and which are so suited to the genius and character of our countrymen. Let our populace leave the Frenchmen to their pistols or swords, the Hollanders to their knives, the Russians to their woman's play, and the Americans to their savage combats; let them retain their honest, national, pugilistic style of contest, in which as much energy and spirit is required as in any other species of combat, where far more activity and hardiness are required, where far more skill may be shewn, and far more generosity be exhibited, than in any of *the other* modes of fighting that we *have pointed* out.

That his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales should have been an encourager of pugilistic sports, was to have been expected of a British prince of his manly form and resolute constitution of mind. He probably saw the science of boxing in the same light that we here view it, and regarded it as worthy his princely patronage, on account of its tendency to make the common people (who in all countries form the defence of nations) robust, courageous, incapable of putting up with an affront, jealous of their honour, and able of themselves to protect it. The timid and the squeamish, who censured these combats as brutal and sanguinary, imputed to the patrons of them the same qualities with which they characterized these encounters. The Prince of Wales, though not in terms, *yet by implication*, was stigma*tized as brutal* and sanguinary for ha-

ving sanctioned by his presence some of these exhibitions. We maintain that he attended them to encourage a noble, manly, and martial spirit in his future subjects, and that the countenance he afforded them was, in sound policy, highly honourable to the judgment of the heir apparent of the British monarchy. In ancient Rome the descendants of the Cæsars, and heirs of the empire, not only were present at all the sanguinary combats of the gladiators, but even sometimes condescended themselves to enter the area at the head of the noble youth of the capital, and display their prowess before the people. By arts such as these the Roman empire attained its greatness, and when luxury crept in, and a general effeminacy of manners caused them to be abolished, the destruction of the empire *became* an inevitable consequence. *Should we then* blame a British prince

for wishing to promote the martial spirit and military habits of his future subjects? Where is he to look for the future security of his crown, but in the skill, bravery, and invincible resolution of his people?

Among the other sports to which the English nation are more peculiarly attached, and what may in some degree be regarded as a national sport, is the amusement of horse-racing. It has received the countenance of some of our sovereigns, Charles II. in particular; and various acts of parliament have been passed for its encouragement, under the idea that it was favourable to the improvement of the breed of horses. The king's plate of one hundred guineas, which is given once a year, or oftener, at most of the respectable race-courses, proceeds upon this idea, and the legislative restriction that no *matches* are to be run for a

less sum than fifty pounds, is to check a spirit of gambling, and to prevent races being run by horses inferior in breed or fleetness.

Since the days of Charles II. who gave Newmarket the ton by visiting it with his court, horse races have been one of the favourite amusements of the nobility and landed gentry of England. The beauty and symmetry of the animal, his docility, the admirable eagerness with which he contends for victory, and the velocity with which he bounds over the plain, determined to conquer or die, form a part of the gratification derived from this noble amusement, which it is easier to imagine than describe.

The King's attachment to the pleasures of the chace, while his health permitted him to partake of that delightful and salubrious exercise, is too *well known* to render any observation

here necessary; but who ever heard this predilection imputed to his majesty as a fault? Is there then so great a difference between the sports of the chace and those of the race-course? Do not the pleasures of both depend in nearly an equal degree upon the exertions and energy of the same generous animal? That the Prince of Wales, in the high blood of his youth, should have shewn himself attached to equestrian exercises, was to be expected from the same propensity, though with a somewhat dissimilar bias, which his majesty had shewn before him, and which, therefore, he might be said to inherit from the example of his royal father.

Without attempting to determine how far the Prince's love of the race-horse was derived from his royal father's predilection to another species *of the animal, to* which we have suf-

ficiently alluded, we may be allowed to add, that at the time when his royal highness became a sportsman, the practice of keeping race-horses was encouraged and countenanced by some of the first and best characters in the nation. The late Mr. Fox, and the late Duke of Bedford, names that can never be mentioned but with veneration and respect, were then leading members of the turf, and many other noblemen and gentlemen of the first distinction and respectability afforded it their sanction. The practice of keeping race-horses had been fashionable, as we have already observed, from the era of Charles II. and there are few great families in the kingdom, who have not, at one, time or other, given in to it.

The Prince of Wales soon after attaining his majority, turned his attention to the collection of a stud of *running* horses; and as he pursued

his object with ardour, his royal highness soon found himself master of a stud of horses not at all inferior to the best in the kingdom. His horses were to be seen at all the celebrated race-courses, and his royal highness often condescended to honour Newmarket and other places of sporting resort with his presence. These amusements were certainly attended with a considerable degree of expence; but no estimate can safely be formed of the expence which his royal highness incurred upon this account, from the circumstance, that the sums of money expended on a racing establishment, and the loss or gain of *bona fide* matches, bear no proportion to the sums that are hazarded upon betting speculations. The expences of a large racing establishment are undoubtedly very considerable, and the sums for *which single* matches are made are

occasionally high; but it is not the expences that are incurred on either of these accounts, that, with the least prudent management, can be hurtful to an individual of large fortune, but the sums that are lost by bets.

What were the sums his royal highness expended on his racing establishment, or in bona fide matches, it is impossible for us to form any estimate, but it may certainly be assumed that they did not amount to more than what his royal highness's station and income fully justified him in expending. With regard to the sums which he expended in betting, it is, from the nature of the thing, not to be expected that we should advance even a guess. The probability is, that his royal highness, like most other gentlemen of the turf, experienced his share of the vicissitudes of fortune, and sometimes *was a considerable* gainer, and at others

a considerable loser. General report, however, made his royal highness a very considerable loser; but there was probably in this case, as well as in many others, a large share of exaggeration, though it is likely that his royal highness's candour, and high spirit of honour, would expose him to some of the artifices of which the gentlemen of the turf have been accused, while his proud and dignified sense of propriety would not allow him to avail himself of those advantages which others would not scruple to practise with impunity at his expence.

Could any certain provision be made, which would effectually secure the sport of horse-racing from the suspicion of foul play, of which the amateurs so frequently accuse each other, there would not be a more noble or *delightful* amusement in existence:

but it unfortunately happens that there is no sport whatever which is liable to so great a variety of unfair practices as that of horse-racing. To enumerate the different tricks which horse-jockies are thought to be in the habit of employing, to give them an undue advantage over their adversaries, would be to write a dissertation on cheats, some of them so curious and extraordinary, that, without a previous and thorough acquaintance with the mysteries of the turf, it would be impossible to comprehend them. Few characters of eminence have distinguished themselves on the turf, who have not been suspected, at one time or other, of these unjustifiable artifices; and hence the graver part of the world have been disposed to view these sporting meetings with any thing else than sentiments of approbation. What, they could not but concede, was inno-

cent in itself, nay even laudable, an exhibition of generous steeds contending for the palm of fleetness, they affirmed had degenerated from its original intention, and had become nothing more than a plausible occasion for drawing two sets of men (such as are always to be found in opulent communities) together, namely, the dupes and the sharpers. These severe moralists divided the patrons of the turf into only two descriptions of men, fools who have money to lose, and knaves who devise plans to rob them of it. Let any one look at the invectives that have been published against horse-racing in innumerable volumes, and have been brought to bear against it on the stage, and in innumerable ways, and they will be convinced that the outcry here alluded to is not in the least exaggerated. It must be con-*fessed too, that* the amateurs of the

turf themselves have given some countenance to these suspicions. Where vast sums of money are at stake, it is no wonderful process of thinking that suspicion should succeed disappointment in the breasts of the losers. So much are we under the influence of self-partiality on almost all the occasions of life, that it is not in the least surprising that a man who bets on his own judgment, if he loses, should rather be inclined to suspect foul play on the part of his antagonist, than admit that his own judgment deceived him. To this we must impute the many disputes that arise among gentlemen sportsmen, and the many recriminations with which they charge each other.

But scarcely any part of the ill character that has attached to the *sports* of the turf, is to be imputed to *the real nobility* and gentry who patro-

nize such amusements, but to a lower class of amateurs, who having little property of their own, and scarcely any respectability in the common transactions of life, study horse-racing as a profession, and scruple at no means, however dishonourable or infamous, to render it a lucrative one. Such men, who it is to be feared are numerous on the turf, and who would bring disgrace on any pursuit however honourable, have the address, in order to shield their own manœuvres from detection, to charge the practices, which probably belong solely to themselves and to the underlings of the race-ground, on persons of the most elevated rank, and thus divert suspicion from themselves to persons who in any other transactions than those of the turf, would be looked upon as incapable, from education, rank, and fortune, of *affording the least* countenance to any

action that bordered the least on meanness, fraud, or dishonesty.

That the Prince of Wales, on attaching himself to the sports of the turf, should have rendered himself liable to these imputations, was a consequence natural to be expected from the equality that necessarily prevails on such occasions. Losers could no more conceal their chagrin when a prince was the winner, than they could when they paid their money to an equal; and they well knew that his royal highness was as liable to be deceived and imposed upon by his grooms, trainers, jockies, and dependants, as any other gentleman of the turf, and therefore, whenever the royal horses did not perform according to their satisfaction, either by winning when they had an extraordinary opinion of their fleetness, or by losing when *they thought* they would prove de-

ficient in spirit and speed, the result was the same—they attributed their disappointment not to any accidental circumstances, over which the Prince of Wales or his servants could not possibly have any controul, but to some unfair manœuvres on the part of the Prince and his dependant for the purpose of misleading the public judgment.

The ostensible sums for which race-horses run form but a very small proportion of the sum total that is depending upon the event of any match of notoriety. The bulk of the money that is hazarded upon such occasions is in the shape of bets; and it has been known, in some cases of great expectation, that so large a sum as one hundred thousand pounds has been actually depending upon the result of a single match. Hence it happens, that the proprietors of the horses are far from being the only persons interested in

the decision of the contest, but a multitude of other persons, as much under the influence of hope or fear as themselves, share with them the anxieties of the race. It is not, therefore, when a race is decided, that a question that concerns the interests of two or three, or half a dozen, or more individuals is determined, but there is a countless multitude of other individuals, who having hazarded sums on the event of the race, if they find their expectations disappointed, conceive themselves at liberty to cry out that one party or the other has played booty, and that the race has been sold. This is, in plain words, charging some quarter, either the master or the servants, with fraud, and, however the phrase may be softened either by cant or technical terms, the meaning is substantially the same—let us express it in the most qualified English, that one party or the

other have proved themselves cheats. In the common transactions of life, in mercantile speculations, for example, this is so serious an imputation, that scarcely any one dare venture to hazard it, and never without very strong grounds; but, in the sporting world, the case is far different. Sportsmen form a community of themselves (like the frequenters of the Stock Exchange), and are governed by a code of laws different from those in usage among ordinary men. Their contracts are contracts of honour; very few of them are cognizable in our courts of justice, because it has been the policy of the legislature to discountenance every sort of gaming speculation, except that on which it bestows its annual protection (lotteries), and to prevent gambling questions from being agitated in our courts of law, and thereby deriving encouragement from the rigid

administration of justice, which so eminently distinguishes the public tribunals of the kin gdom

Under these disadvantages, it became necessary for the gentlemen of the turf to institute a court of their own, which, observing some of the formalities of the ordinary courts, as the solemnity of an oath, in the examination of witnesses, should decide upon the disputes that might arise among them, and their decision, in matters of this kind, was to be regarded as final. Of this nature was the Jockey Club. The decisions of this body were confidently appealed to by all who thought themselves aggrieved by any sporting transactions, and the fiats of the club were regarded as standard authority by all who were engaged in any pursuits within purview of its cognizance.

The nature of this institution has

been most egregiously mis-represented. It was principally of a social nature. The places where the individuals who composed it met, were not places where individual hospitality could be exercised; neither did the number of its members render prudent the exercise of hospitality to an almost unlimited number of guests. The mixed quality of the members too was to be taken into consideration. They consisted of individuals of various heterogeneous descriptions, whether we consider rank, station, wealth, or personal eminence, or the opposite qualities of character.

But what we have here principally to advert to, is the weight and influence which this body exercises over all the transactions of the sporting world. This has not always been rightly understood. The decisions of the Jockey Club have been supposed to emanate

from that body at large; but this is far from being the case, and indeed it would be widely apart from justice were it so, because it happens in most questions that are referred to the Jockey Club for its decision, that the majority of the members of the club are the persons of all others the most interested in such decision, and consequently the most unfit to sit upon judgment. It would certainly render this celebrated association of sportsmen a very improper tribunal for the cognizance of their disputes, if every individual member of it were to be considered as a judge, or be permitted to vote in cases where his own interest was immediately concerned. But this is by no means the case. The Jockey Club is much better constituted. Whenever disputed questions arise among sportsmen, and its authority is appealed to, reference is not had to individual

members who have any interest in the decision, but to other members, who, being free from all engagements connected with the matter in dispute, might be presumed to be the most likely and competent persons to pronounce an honest and equitable judgment.

But perfection is not the nature of any human institution, and therefore that the Jockey Club should sometimes err in its decisions, can excite no surprize. In the autumn of the year 1791 the Prince of Wales came under the cognizance of this tribunal, and its decision proved so disagreeable to him that he immediately retired from the turf. The circumstances attending this transaction, which produced so extraordinary a sensation in the sporting world at the period it happened, were nearly as follows:

On the 20th of October, 1791, the Prince of Wales's horse *Escape*, then

reckoned the best horse upon the turf, was beaten at Newmarket by two horses of inferior reputation. The odds, which, previous to this race, had run high in favour of *Escape*, now changed against him, and it was the general opinion of the sporting world that he would lose the match he had to run the next day. Accordingly bets were made to a large amount, and with great odds, that *Escape* would lose; but contrary to the opinion and much to the disappointment of the knowing ones, *Escape* won his race.

The jockey who rode *Escape* on these two memorable days, published a pamphlet * a short time before his death,

* "Genius Genuine, by Samuel Chifney of Newmarket. Containing a full account of the Prince's horse Escape's running at Newmarket, on the 20th and 21st Days of October, 1791." This curious production made a considerable noise in the sporting world, and though only the size of an ordinary pamphlet, containing one hundred and thirty pages, sold at the enormous price of two pounds.

in which he very satisfactorily accounted for *Escape's* losing his first, and winning his second race. The mystery was nothing more than this; that on the first day's race Escape, for the want of proper exercise, was not in a fit condition to run; and that the exercise of the first day's race had opened his pores, and enabled him to perform better on the second day; but this was far from appearing satisfactory to the gentlemen of the turf, and as soon as the race was concluded, a rumour was propagated that *Escape* had run unfairly on the first day's race. Chifney's own account of these particulars is so very curious, that we should do wrong to withhold it from our readers.

"As I came from scale," says Chifney, "I was told that Mr. W. Lake (*brother to* Lord Viscount Lake, *and the gentleman* who had the ma-

nagement of the Prince of Wales's running horses) had been saying something improper to his royal highness concerning *Escape's* winning; I made it therefore my business to go immediately to his royal highness, who was riding with a gentleman near to the Great Stand House, and he immediately accosted me in the following words:—'Sam Chifney, as soon as *Escape's* race was over, Mr. Lake came up to *me*, and said, 'I give your royal highness joy; but I am sorry the horse has won, I would sooner have given a hundred guineas.' 'I told Mr. Lake that I did not understand him, that he must explain himself.' I then made his royal highness answer saying; 'Yes, your royal highness, it is very necessary he should explain himself.' This is all that passed on *the subject* to-day."

Chifney's further account of this

remarkable affair is as follows:—" On the 22nd of October, 1791, in the morning after *Escape* had won, his royal highness sent for me into his dressing room, and then ordered me to be shewn into an adjoining room, where he thus accosted me:—' Sam Chifney, I have sent for you on some very unpleasant business. I am told, Sam Chifney, that you won six or seven hundred pounds upon the race on the day before yesterday, where you rode *Escape,* and was beat upon him.'

" I replied, that I believed his royal highness had not such an opinion of me.'

" His royal highness continued:—' I am told, Sam Chifney, that you won six or seven hundred pounds upon the race yesterday, where you rode *Escape,* and won upon him: and I am told that Vauxhall Clark (clerk of the *stables to the Prince* of Wales) won

all the money for you.' I answered, 'May I not offend by asking who it was that dared to tell your royal highness so?'

"His royal highness replied, 'Sam Chifney, I wish to know whether you have any objection to take your affidavit, naming all the bets you had upon the race, every way, when you rode *Escape*, and was beaten upon him on the day before yesterday.' I acknowledged my readiness to do it, if it would give his royal highness any satisfaction. His royal highness said, '*Sam Chifney, your doing it will give yourself satisfaction, it will give the public satisfaction, it will give me satisfaction.* You will specify in your affidavit all the bets you had upon both day's races; when that you rode *Escape* on the day before yesterday, and was beat upon him; and yesterday, *when that* you rode Escape, and won

upon him, naming all the bets you had upon both those races, and to take your affidavit as such. I hope, Sam Chifney, you do not misunderstand me.' I answered, that I did perfectly understand, and that I would take care to do as his royal highness had ordered me.

"His royal highness said, 'Sam Chifney, I wish to know if you have any objection against being examined by the Jocky Club, and in any way that they are pleased to think proper.' To which I most fully and freely consented.

"His royal highness said, 'I am told, Sam Chifney, that you were arrested at Ascot Heath for 300*l.* and that Vauxhall Clark paid the money for you.' I replied that this was the first word I had ever heard upon the subject. His royal highness said, 'Sam Chifney, I wish to know if you *have any objection* to make an affida-

vit that you were not arrested at Ascot Heath, and that Vauxhall Clark did not pay 300*l.* for you?' I replied to his royal highness, 'I am very willing to do it."

After relating some inconsequential particulars, Chifney proceeds to state, that "on the same morning (22nd of October, 1791) his royal highness called me across the betting ring. I instantly obeyed his commands, and his royal highness put me between himself and Sir Charles Bunbury, and then rode out upon the heath. After his royal highness and Sir Charles had talked upon the subject, his royal highness said, 'Sam Chifney, I think you told me that you were willing to be examined by the stewards of the Jockey Club in any way they should please to think proper.' I said, 'your highness, *I am proud to meet any man upon the subject.*' His royal highness

then addressed himself to Sir Charles Bunbury. 'There, Sir Charles, you hear him say that he is proud to meet any man upon the subject. Now, Sir Charles, I beg of you to take every pains you possibly can, so as to make yourselves perfectly satisfied; and then enclose me Sam Chifney's affidavits, and apprize me how the business ends, as I am going to Brighton to-night.' His royal highness left Sir Charles, and rode near the betting ring, where, after he stood a little while, he said, 'Sam Chifney, *this business should be explained.*' I answered, 'Your royal highness, *I don't know how to explain it.*' His royal highness then rode off the turf to town, before the day's sport was finished, and I immediately went home. Soon after this I received from Mr. Weatherby, clerk to the Jockey Club, copies of affidavits which I *swore before the* Rev. Dr. Framp-

ton; naming that I had no bet upon the race when I rode *Escape* on the 20th of October, 1791, and that I had twenty guineas, and no more, betted upon *Escape* on the following day, when I rode him on the 21st of October, 1791; and that I had the same desire of winning upon *Escape* when I rode him on the 20th of October, 1791, as I had when I rode him on the following day, the 21st of October, 1791, and further, that I had never been arrested on Ascot Heath, and that Mr. Vauxhall Clark never did pay any money for me. When I had sworn these affidavits, they were signed by the Rev. Dr. Frampton, and I immediately returned them to Mr. Weatherby.

"I was then had up before the stewards of the Jockey Club, who were Sir Charles Bunbury, Bart. Ralph Dutton, *Esq.* and Thomas Panton, Esq.

" Sir Charles Bunbury asked me some few questions:—What bets I had upon the first day's race, when I rode *Escape* on the 20th of October, 1791; and what bets I had upon the race when I rode *Escape* on the following day, when he won, and who made my bets for me?' I answered that I had no bets upon the first day's race; that I betted twenty guineas upon *Escape* the next day, and no more; and that Vauxhall Clark betted for me.

" Sir Charles Bunbury then proceeded to ask me what was my motive for waiting with *Escape* on the first day.

" I told Sir Charles Bunbury that he was a wrong judge of his man.

" Sir Charles Bunbury now stopped, and looked about apparently dissatisfied.

" Mr. Dutton said, I think Chifney *spoke very fair.*

" Mr. Panton immediately said, *yes, very fair.*

" Sir Charles Bunbury did not ask me any more questions.

" I then said to Sir Charles and the two other gentlemen, that my motive for waiting with *Escape* was, because I knew he could run very fast; I likewise knew *Sky Lark* could run fast, though a jade, for I had ridden against him most of the races he had run.

" I was now dismissed, and this is every thing that passed with me from and to the Prince of Wales, Mr. W. Lake, and the Jockey Club, on this subject, at Newmarket.

" It may appear to some persons that I was too dry and harsh in my answer to Sir Charles Bunbury: the two other stewards, however, acknowledged it to be fair. I at this time *made affidavit,* and had answered every

particular that was necessary for the Jockey Club ; and this question of Sir Charles's, to know my motives for waiting, went into private trials and abilities. But it was a personal reason which caused me thus to answer Sir Charles. I had been told by a nobleman, that a baronet, and a member of the Jockey Club, I believe Sir Charles Bunbury, had severely reprobated my conduct on being beat on Escape."

After some reflections, which would only be found interesting to those who are concerned in the management of running horses, Chifney concludes his narrative in the following words.— " Some weeks after this, and I well remember that it was after the Duke of York's coming from abroad with the Duchess, Sir John Lade wrote to me at Newmarket, for me to attend on the Prince immediately. I went to *Carlton House* directly, and the Prince

of Wales told me, that Sir Charles Bunbury came to him and told him, that if he suffered Chifney to ride his horses, that no gentleman would start against him. His royal highness said, he told Sir Charles Bunbury that if he or any other person could make it appear that Sam Chifney had done wrong, then he would never speak to him again; and without that he would not sacrifice him to any person. His royal highness then said he should leave the turf, as he could not be guilty of that ingratitude to let his horses go over for the forfeits, after being told that no gentleman would start against him, but that he should pay the forfeits and leave the turf. His royal highness then said, he could see the meaning of it.—' They think you, Sam Chifney, a good rider, and they think you have won a race or two *for me that* you had no business to

have won; and that there are others who wish to have you, and others who think you too good for me, as they know you will not see me robbed.' His royal highness then told me, he should always be glad to see me, and for my own sake to let him see me often; and that if he ever kept horses again, that I should train and manage them. After this I was ordered to attend on his royal highness at Sir John Lade's, in Picadilly, which I did; and in the presence of Sir John Lade and Mr. Phylips, his royal highness put his hand upon his bosom and said, that he believed Sam Chifney had been to him very honest, and wished me to understand, that the two hundred guineas a year he gave me, was for his life, saying, 'I cannot give it for your life, I can only give it for my own life.' I bowed to his royal highness, *and said, I was* as well satisfied."

In 1802, Chifney relates, that at the Brighton and Lewis race time, as the Prince of Wales was walking on the Steyne, hold of a gentleman's arm, he approached and told his royal highness that they cried out very much for him at Newmarket. His royal highness said, "Sam Chifney, there has never been a proper apology made; and they used me and you very ill; they are bad people; I'll not set foot on the ground more." *

* The transactions of the 20th and 21st of October, 1791, continuing for many years to operate to Chifney's disadvantage in his profession, he was at length induced to make the following affidavit.

MIDDLESEX.

"Samuel Chifney, of Newmarket, in the county of Cambridge, rider, maketh oath, and saith, that he this deponent did ride a horse called *Escape*, belonging to the Prince of Wales, in a race, in which he was beaten, on the twentieth day of October, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one, at Newmarket; and that he did also at Newmarket ride the same *horse in another* race on the next day, viz. the *twenty-first* day of October, one thousand seven

Such was the termination of the Prince of Wales's connection with

hundred and ninety-one, in which he won.—And this deponent further saith, that he made no bet whatsoever against *Escape* for the twentieth day of October, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one, when he was beaten; but this deponent had one bet of twenty guineas upon *Escape*, and no more, for the twenty-first day of October, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one, when he won; which was betted for the deponent by Mr. Vauxhall Clark.—And this deponent further saith, that he was not interested or concerned, directly or indirectly, in any other bet whatever against or for Escape, for either of the before mentioned days.—And this deponent further maketh oath, and saith, that previous to, and on the said twentieth day of October, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one, he neither did, nor caused, or procured to be done, any thing to check, hinder, or prevent the said horse, called *Escape*, from winning; but on the contrary, that this deponent did every thing which his judgment suggested to him, and his powers enabled him, to make Escape win the race he ran on the said twentieth day of October, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one.--And this deponent further maketh oath, and saith, that in no place that he has had the honour of living in, for these last sixteen years and upwards, that he has not won a guinea against any horse that he was beat, where that he either *trained or rode him*.—And that he further *maketh oath, and saith*, that that which is as-

Newmarket. His royal highness upon this occasion seems to have acted with a very proper degree of spirit and firmness, and it would not be easy to produce any reason to justify the Jockey Club for declaring, that if his royal highness did not discharge Chifney from his service, no gentleman would allow his horses to run against him. There was something so very imperious in this requisition, that it was impossible that his royal highness should comply

serted in the foregoing narrative or statement is true with his thoughts on the same.

SAMUEL CHIFNEY.

"Sworn before me this 13th day of March, 1801.

JOHN COLLICK."

The latter part of the affidavit relates to the narrative from which our former extracts were made, and is a strong corroboration of its authenticity.——Chifney was a man of some eccentricity, but one of the best jockies of the day, and on that account ill used. When the Prince left the turf, on account of Escape's running, Mr. Vernon (the father of the turf) said that "the *Prince having* the best horses, and the best jockey, *was best* off the turf."

with it; and it is not a little extraordinary that the Prince of Wales had no bets on the first day's race, and that on the second day's race his bets on *Escape* did not exceed four hundred guineas. Was this a sum that the Prince of Wales could possibly be guilty of any unfair manœuvre to win? Was this a sum that any but a mere common swindler of the turf would have hazarded his reputation to gain, by fraud and deception? Could it for a moment be thought, that for so paltry a sum as four hundred guineas, the Prince of Wales would commit an action not only unworthy of his rank, but which any gentleman would be ashamed of doing? Had the sum depending upon the event of the race been many thousand pounds, there might have been some temptation to foul play, though the fraud would still have been as dishonour-

able. But in the present instance the Prince of Wales had no adequate motive for doing a thing so mean, and so unworthy of elevated rank and unsullied character.

It may be asked, why did not the Prince of Wales declare upon his honour that no foul play had been used with respect to Escape's first race? Such a declaration would at once have solved all difficulties, and put an end to all embarrassments. But was it proper for the Prince of Wales to have condescended to such a submission? Are there not sometimes suspicions of so disgraceful a nature afloat, and at the same time so improbable withal, that if the person, who is the object of them, condescends to reply to them, he degrades himself? Was is to be expected of the Prince of Wales, that he should purge himself, by oath, like his domestic? Or

was it to be looked for, that the first subject in the realm, the personage whose simple word should have commanded deference, respect, and belief, was to submit himself to the examination of the Jockey Club, and answer such questions as they might have thought proper to have proposed to him? That his royal highness could have satisfactorily answered all such questions we are firmly persuaded, but at the same time we are fully of opinion that it would have been in the highest degree incompatible with the dignity of the Prince to have submitted to any such interrogatories. He did every thing that could, with due delicacy and respect to his rank and character, be required of him. He permitted his servant to be examined before the stewards of the Jockey Club, and even urged them to take every possible pains to come at a

thorough investigation of the matter. What more could he have done?

We have been thus particular in our relation of this affair, because we are aware it excited a very strong sensation in the sporting world at the period when it occurred, and because we know that sentiments unfavourable to his royal highness, in regard to this transaction, prevailed long after the Prince had withdrawn from the turf. If any such unfavourable impressions remain, we hope our statement will remove them. Had our opinion in relation to his royal highness's conduct on this occasion been unfavourable, we should not have hesitated to avow it; but, after the most minute examination of all the particulars that have come to our knowledge, we do not hesitate to express our sincere conviction, that in the whole of these transactions the Prince acted a most manly, up-

right, and honourable part. We have shewn, in the first instance, that his royal highness had no adequate motive for any foul play on either of the days that *Escape* ran his matches. On the first he had no bets depending; and on the second day, the stake he had depending was far too inconsiderable to have produced any bias on his royal highness's mind, so as to have led him to the commission of a dishonourable action. Men do not commit dishonourable actions without some adequate motive; and that we should believe the Prince of Wales was privy to, or conniving at, or commanding the dishonesty of his servant, is far too monstrous a proposition for us to accede to. To this we may add, that Chifney, without whose co-operation the scheme must have been defective, or at least very liable to detection, puts the most solemn negative on the

imputation. It must have been by Chifney's management that *Escape*, if capable of winning, lost the first race, and occasioned the great alteration in the betting odds that occurred previous to the second race. But this management Chifney denies in the most solemn terms, and we have an opportunity of knowing that he persisted in this statement, to the last moment of his life. Interest, a natural desire to stand well in the opinion of his contemporaries, together with many other considerations, might have induced Chifney, whilst in the vigour of his health, to persist in this statement, and even to substantiate it by the sanctity of an oath; but when he was on the verge of the grave, and when he could have no possible motive for persisting in a falsehood, his voluntary and repeated asseverations that his *first* declaration was correct, furnish a

strong corroborating evidence to induce us to give credit to his statement. We know also that Chifney died in a state of comparative indigence and want. Was this likely to have happened had he been in possession of so important a secret, as the knowledge of any thing dishonourable in the conduct of the Prince respecting his turf engagements? Would he not have availed himself of such a circumstance to have relieved himself from his embarrassment? or had he failed in that attempt, would he not have given vent to his disappointment by disclosing the secret?

Viewing the subject in every possible light, we cannot see the slightest ground for suspecting the Prince of Wales of any thing dishonourable in his sporting engagements; on the contrary, he appears to us to have acted with the utmost fairness and

candour; and in withdrawing from the turf, to have done nothing more than what the unmerited and unbecoming treatment he received called for.

CHAPTER II.

RECAPITULATION OF THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS — VINDICATION OF THE PRINCE OF WALES FROM THE ATTACKS OF HIS CALUMNIATORS— HIS CONDUCT TOWARDS MRS. ROBINSON REVIEWED—HIS CHOICE OF HIS FRIENDS DEFENDED—MR. FOX'S DESCRIPTION OF THE FRIENDS OF THE PRINCE—STATE OF PARTIES AT THE PERIOD WHEN HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS ATTAINED HIS MAJORITY — THOUGHTS ON THE PRINCE'S FIRST PECUNIARY EMBARRASSMENTS —ON THE REGENCY—AND ON HIS SPORTING ENGAGEMENTS.

We have shewn in the early chapters of this work, we believe, that the Prince's connection with Mrs. Robinson had nothing very offensive in it either to good morals or decorum. It was a case stained with no remarkable *turpiture* or gross departure from the

moral laws of society. It was not a case of seduction, and the person who of all others had the most right to complain, had released his wife from her vow by his own estrangement of conduct. Here then was nothing very flagrant in this particular action of the Prince's life; yet it has been much dwelt upon by those who have made the abuse of the Prince of Wales (and such men there are) their livelihood. These ungenerous and unprincipled writers, who look into characters only for the purpose of finding faults, have stigmatized this transaction in the most virulent terms, and have inferred from his attachment to a beautiful and amiable woman, an unbounded and promiscuous passion for the sex in general. This calumny, equally detestable and unfounded, has been propagated in a hundred ways, *and there is* reason to apprehend with

too much success, for no one can be ignorant how much quicker scandal flies, and how much more tenaciously it is retained than truth.

Discit enim citius, meminitque libentius illud,
Quod quis deridet, quam quod probat, et veneratur.

The youth of the Prince, and the seductions to which his rank exposed him, never enter into the calculations of these writers. It is not for their purpose to seek out extenuating circumstances, but to magnify what are, at worst, mere levities or indiscretions, or the pardonable ebulitions of youth. By what analogy was it to be expected, that the generous blood of the heir apparent was to be ice-bound, while that of every other noble youth in the kingdom might run riot, and flow without reproach?

The next charge that has been most confidently urged against the Prince *of Wales,* is that of having made an

improper choice of his associates. This charge, we think, we have satisfactorily repelled. We have shewn that some of the Prince's friends were the men of all others in the kingdom most distinguished for their talents, eloquence, and constitutional knowledge; others were men whose personal virtues and patriotic principles reflected lustre on their splendid lineage, and challenged even the admiration of their opponents. Whatever was noble in rank, was eminent in ability, or illustrious for public service, was to be found among the associates of the Prince. They were the men whom Mr. Fox, on some occasion of similar calumny, not more elegantly than truly described (and his words with very little periphrase might be put into the mouth of the Prince of Wales *), as a

* *Among the* many other despicable modes *resorted to, to* lessen the Prince of Wales in the

body of men renowned for their ancestry, important for their possessions,

good opinion of the public, none is more contemptible, or shews a more miserable lack of invention, than that, the sole wit of which consists in making him speak the language of some dissolute character, in a dissolute scene, in a play. We have not Barrow at hand to consult his luminous and excellent definition of wit, which is indeed one of the most admirable passages in the compass of the English language, but we dare venture to affirm, that this sort of miserable and bastard attempt at humour is not among his definitions of wit. We excuse the cutting sarcasms of Junius, while we deny their validity, for their epigrammatic point and elegance; he does not knock his heroes down with a bludgeon, but he draws blood with a lance of polished steel. Junius is still read and admired, though no person of the present day believes the Duke of Grafton was "the meanest and basest scoundrel in the kingdom, one man excepted," or that Lord Mansfield was an individual to whom with justice "every term of reproach had been applied, and exhausted;" yet Junius delights us on account of the attic pungency of his satire: we read him as a classic, not for the scandal that his pages contain, but on account of the vivacity of his wit, and the elegant language in which it is conveyed. But it is one of the misfortunes of the Prince of Wales, that the dullness of his calumniators keeps *an equal pace* with their malignity. Their *jokes are so coarse* and clumsy, their ribaldry so

distinguished for their personal worth, with all that is valuable to men at stake, hereditary fortunes, and hereditary honours. "With such men," said this illustrious statesman, "I am something — without them, nothing. My reliance is upon their good opinion; and in that respect, perhaps, I am fortunate. Although I have a just confidence in my own integrity, yet as I am but a man, perhaps it is well that I have no choice but between my own eternal disgrace, and a faithful duty; whilst these kind of men are

common-place and vulgar, and their attempts at wit so perfectly puerile, that they never excite a smile, unless it be a smile of contempt. They bear about them in some respects the quality of the torpedo. Whatever they handle they are sure to benumb. Things that are really humorous and excellent in themselves, they contrive so barbarously to mangle, and so vilely to misplace, that they lose all their essence. The wit of Sheridan, rich, spirited, and classical, degenerates in their hands into the meanness and *buffoonery of* the drolls of Bartholomew fair.

overseers of my conduct; whilst men whose uprightness of heart and spotless honour are even proverbial in the country, are the vigils of my deeds, it is a pledge to the public for the purity and rectitude of my conduct. The prosperity and honour of the country are blended with the prosperity and honour of these illustrious persons; they have so much at stake, that if the country falls, they fall with it; and to countenance any thing against its interests, would be a suicide upon themselves. The good opinion and protection of these men then is a security to the nation for my behaviour, because if I forfeit their regard, I lose my all." In this way the Prince of Wales might have replied to his detractors, when he had collected round his person the Howards, the Russels, the Cavendishes, and the other great whig families *of the upper* house, the descend-

ants of those patriots by whom the glorious revolution of 1688 was achieved, and who placed the house of Brunswick on the throne. In this manner might the heir apparent have replied to his oppugners when he had attached to his person all the first rate ability of the lower house, all that party of whom it has well been said, that "it was never known to sacrifice the interests, or barter the liberties of the nation for mercenary purposes, for personal emolument or honours; a party linked together upon principles which comprehended whatever is dear and most precious to free men, and essential to a free constitution."

At the period when the Prince of Wales had his own choice of his associates, there were but two sets of public men in the kingdom from whom he could have taken his friends. The one *of these* were the ministers of the

crown, or rather the creatures of the court, whose pernicious counsels and measures had led to the dismemberment of the empire; the other was composed of the party who had opposed the counsels of those men, and pointed out the fatal tendency of their measures. The Prince of Wales, at the conclusion of the American war, was of an age to feel for the loss of so large a proportion of his natural inheritance. Was it then to be expected of him that he should take to his confidence, or admit to his familiarity, the men to whose sordid intrigues, and mischievous advice, so many of the disasters, and so much of the disgrace of his royal father's reign, were justly imputable? Was it not more natural for him to look at such men with mixed emotions of apprehension and distaste?

With regard to the first pecuniary

embarrassments of the Prince of Wales, all that we deemed it necessary to advance in excuse of his royal highness was, that as he had a smaller income than former Princes of Wales of his family had enjoyed at periods when the value of money was higher, it was neither very extraordinary nor very culpable, that his royal highness should find himself unable to confine his expences within the limits of his income. Immoral actions are no more to be excused in youth than they are in old age; but to look for the prudence, economy, and regularity of seventy in a generous and high spirited youth of four or five and twenty, is to expect from human nature what in our views of it we have never been able to find.

On the subject of the King's illness, and the subsequent discussions that *were gone into* for the purpose of

vesting the royal authority in the Prince of Wales, we stated our opinion with great freedom. We can well remember that interesting period. We thought at that time, as we still think, that the Prince of Wales had a clear and indubitable right to the regency. We thought then, and we still think, that his royal highness's conduct on that trying and delicate occasion was manly, consistent, and honourable, becoming his duty as a son, and worthy of his character as a prince. Had the Prince of Wales succeeded to the regency under all the restrictions and limitations proposed, it is scarcely possible but that his government must have fallen into confusion and disorder. What was asked for him was no more than what the exigencies of the state required, and the powers which the constitution *would have* given him in the case of a

natural demise. Indeed, it is impossible to review the transactions of this period, without feeling for what must have been the sensations of the Prince of Wales at the treatment he received from an arrogant and supercilious minister. Deemed unworthy to be trusted with the temporary occupation of the throne, every restraint that jealousy or suspicion could devise, was resorted to to fetter and circumscribe his authority. Happily for the Prince of Wales that he was not called upon to undertake the government under such mortifying and humiliating circumstances, and the nation was spared the danger of an experiment full of difficulty and hazard.

We have also endeavoured (and we are sanguine enough to think not without success) to correct some misrepresentations that have gone abroad, in *respect to the* relaxations of the lighter

hours of the Prince of Wales. Our apology for pugilism must rest upon its own grounds; the arguments we have advanced in its favour appear to us decisively satisfactory; but should they not appear so to others, we have only to lament the weakness of our own reasoning, and to wish that so noble a science had met with an abler advocate. With regard to the Prince's turf engagements, we hope we have vindicated his royal highness from some of the worst aspersions against his character, which for a series of years have been current in the sporting world. We could have advanced more on the subject, but the improbability and baseness of the main charge seemed to us so monstrous, as to carry its own refutation with it.

A variety of important transactions remain to be recorded. We shall

endeavour to perform our duty to the Prince and the public with equal fidelity. His royal highness is too elevated in mind as well as in station to receive any gratification from the offerings of flattery, and would, we are sure, look down on those who should seek his favour by servile adulation with the same silent contempt that he views the attacks of those mercenary or disappointed beings who are incessantly labouring to sink his character in the estimation of the public. We have seen in a recent instance (of which we shall have occasion hereafter to speak more at large) how soon a cringing sycophant may be transformed into a verulent defamer; and being unbiassed by hopes or fears, having nothing to hope from the Prince's bounty, *but what* all good and loyal men

may hope, and nothing to fear from his displeasure, but what bad men must dread, we shall pursue our course without restraint, making truth the object and end of our labours.

CHAPTER III.

MARRIAGE OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE OF WALES — CEREMONIAL OF THE ROYAL NUPTIALS—HIS MAJESTY'S MESSAGE TO PARLIAMENT RESPECTING THE PRINCE'S EMBARRASSMENTS — PROPOSITIONS BROUGHT FORWARD BY MR. PITT ON THE OCCASION—RESTRICTIONS FOR THE PREVENTION OF FUTURE DEBTS—SPEECH OF MR. FOX—DIVISION OF THE HOUSE.

THE marriage of the heir apparent of the British crown has always been considered as a matter of the highest national importance. The reason of this may be easily conceived; that the British nation, blessed beyond all others with a free constitution, and the *liberty of* delivering their sentiments *on public* affairs through the medium

of their representatives in parliament, may be enabled to transmit the benefits they enjoy unimpaired to their posterity.

It has generally been supposed that the Prince of Wales was averse to marriage, and that for sometime he resisted all proposals that were made to him on the subject; but the Duke of York having no issue by his duchess, and the length of time that had elapsed since his marriage rendering it improbable that he should have issue, the Prince of Wales was prevailed on by motives of state policy, and by a desire to relieve himself from the embarrassment of a heavy load of debt under which he laboured, at length to consent to marry. The person fixed upon for his consort was his cousin, her serene highness the Princess Caroline Amelia Elizabeth, second

daughter of his serene highness the Duke of Brunswick, by his duchess, Augusta, elder sister of his majesty, and formerly Princess Royal of Great Britain, born the 17th of May, 1768.

On the evening of the 8th of April, 1795, the solemnity of the marriage of his royal highness the Prince of Wales, with her highness the Princess Caroline of Brunswick, was performed in the chapel royal, St. James's, by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The processions, to and from the chapel, were in the following order.

THE PROCESSION OF THE BRIDE.

Drums and Trumpets.
Kettle Drums.
Sergeant Trumpeter.
Master of the Ceremonies.
The Bride's Gentleman Usher between the two senior Heralds.
His Majesty's Vice Chamberlain.
His majesty's Lord Chamberlain.

The Bride,
In her nuptial habit, with a coronet, led by his
Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence,
her train borne by four unmarried
daughters of Dukes and
Earls, viz.
Lady Mary Osborne, Lady Charl. Spencer,
Lady Caroline Villers, Lady Charlotte Legge:
And her highness was attended by the
ladies of her household.

On entering the chapel, her highness was conducted to the seat prepared for her, near her majesty's chair of state. The master of the ceremonies, with the gentleman usher, retired to the places assigned them.

The lord chamberlain, and vice chamberlain, with a herald, returned to attend the bridegroom; the senior herald remaining in the chapel, to conduct the several persons to their respective places.

THE BRIDEGROOM'S PROCESSION.

In the same order as that of the

bride, with the addition of the officers of his royal highness's household.

His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales,
In his collar of the order of the Garter, supported
by two unmarried Dukes, viz.
Duke of Bedford, Duke of Roxburgh:

And his royal highness being conducted to his seat in the chapel, the lord chamberlain, vice chamberlain, and two heralds, returned to attend his majesty.

THEIR MAJESTIES' PROCESSION.

Drums and Trumpets as before.
Knight Marshal.
Pursuivants.
Heralds.
Treasurer of the Household.
Master of the Horse.
Two married Dukes, viz.
Duke of Leeds, Duke of Beaufort.
Lord Steward of the Household.
Provincial King of Arms.

Sergeants at Arms.	Lord Privy Seal, Lord President of the Council.	Sergeants at Arms.

Archbishop of York.
Lord High Chancellor.
Archbishop of Canterbury.
Garter Principal King at Arms, with his sceptre,
between two Gentlemen Ushers.
The Earl Marshal, with his staff.
Princes of the Blood Royal, viz.
Prince William,
His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester.
His Royal Highness the Duke of York.
Sword of State, borne by the Duke of Portland,
between the Lord Chamberlain and Vice
Chamberlain of the Household.
His Majesty,
In the Collar of the Order of the Garter.

Captain of the Yeomen of the Guards.	Colonel of the Life Guards in Waiting.	Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners.

The Lord of the Bed-chamber in waiting.
Master of the Robes.
Groom of the Bed-chamber.
Vice Chamberlain to the Queen.
Her Majesty,
Between the Queen's Lord Chamberlain, and the
Queen's Master of the Horse.
Their Royal Highnesses the Princess Royal,
Princess Augusta Sophia,

Princess Elizabeth,
Princess Mary,
Princess Sophia,
Princess Amelia,
Her Royal Highness the Duchess of York,
Princess Sophia of Gloucester,
Supported severally by their Gentlemen Ushers.
The Ladies of her Majesty's Bed-chamber.
Maids of Honour.
Women of her Majesty's Bed-chamber.

Upon entering the chapel, the several persons in the procession were conducted to the places appointed for them. Their majesties went to their chairs on the haut pas, the bride and bridegroom to their seats, and the rest of the royal family to those prepared for them.

At the conclusion of the marriage service their majesties retired to their chairs of state under the canopy, while the anthem was performing. The procession afterwards returned in the following manner:—

Drums and Trumpets as before.
Master of the Ceremonies.
The Princess's Gentleman Usher between two Heralds.
Officers of the Prince's Household.
His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales leading the Bride,
and supported by two married Dukes, viz.
Duke of Beaufort, Duke of Leeds.
The Ladies of Her Royal Highness's Household.

The procession, at the return, filed off in the privy chamber. Their majesties, the bridegroom and bride, with the rest of the royal family, and the great officers, proceeded into the levee chamber, where the registry of the marriage was attested with the usual formalities; after which the procession continued into the lesser drawing room; and their majesties, with the bridegroom and bride, and the rest of the royal family, passed into the great council chamber, where the great officers, nobility, foreign ministers, and

other persons of distinction, paid their compliments on the occasion.

The evening concluded with very splendid illuminations, and other public demonstrations of joy, throughout London and Westminster.

In a few days the two houses of parliament voted unanimous addresses of congratulation to their majesties, and to the Prince and Princess of Wales; and their example was followed by the corporation of London, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and most of the other great bodies in the kingdom.

As one of the conditions of the Prince's marriage was, that he should be exonerated from the pecuniary embarrassments under which he laboured, a message from the King was delivered to both houses of parliament on account of the debts of the Prince of Wales, on the 27th of April.—The message stated the reliance of his ma-

jesty upon their generosity for enabling him to settle an establishment upon the Prince and his august bride, suited to their rank and dignity,—that the benefit of any settlement now to be made could not be effectually secured to the Prince, till he was relieved from his present incumbrance to a large amount, —but, that his majesty did not propose to his parliament any other means of providing for this object, than the application of a part of the income which might be settled on the Prince, and the approbation, for a certain time, of the revenues of the duchy of Cornwall, declaring his readiness to concur in any plan of establishing a regular arrangement in the Prince's future expenditure, and of guarding against the possibility of his being again involved.

As this communication was made at a season of much national embarrass-

ment, and when the discontents of the people ran high, we cannot be surprised that it should have excited a considerable sensation among some of the independent members of the House of Commons. After the reading of his majesty's message, Mr. Pitt moved for a committee to consider it that day se'nnight, upon which Colonel Stanley (member for Lancashire) moved for reading the address to the house on the 24th of May, 1787. This related to the former discharge of the Prince's incumbrances, and being read, Mr. Stanley observed that the house had already liberally paid the debts of the Prince; and he wished for a call of the house, that the attendance, upon an affair of so much importance, might be as full as possible. This was opposed by Mr. Pitt, who stated that it *was not* his majesty's intention to re*quire a specific* sum for the discharge

of the principal debts, but to set apart a certain portion of that income which might be granted by the liberality of parliament, to their gradual discharge. An establishment for the Prince of Wales, he said, had long been a matter of general expectation. In a provision to be made for supporting the dignity and spendour of the heir apparent, it was certainly necessary to free his affairs of all clogs and embarrassments. Comparing the grants made to the grandfather of his royal highness, at a time when the scale of expence was infinitely less, the sum to be now proposed was comparatively small. Mr. Pitt then enlarged upon the necessity of supporting the dignity and splendour of every branch of the royal family; and argued, that, on a subject of such general obviousness, there was no necessity for a call of the house.

While the public attention was called

to this interesting question by the discussions in parliament, a variety of publications issued from the press, teeming with the most virulent abuse of the Prince of Wales. Had the administration of the day been half so bitterly reviled, the files of the Court of King's Bench would have been crowded with official informations of the attorney-general to prosecute the offenders; but the libels against the Prince of Wales were passed over without notice. The season too was favourable to their propagation. The criminal excesses of the French revolution were recent in the recollection of every one, and it was circulated with industry, and believed with avidity, that the mischiefs which had fallen on royalty in that country had been produced by the prodigality of the French princes. There was not *much foundation* for this accusation,

but as it was one that every one could understand and apply, it was widely spread, and found almost universal acceptance. It is to be taken into consideration likewise, that at this period there were many disaffected persons in the three kingdoms, who wished for an alteration in the government. These persons were not disaffected to the Prince personally, but they were disinclined to royalty generally, and as the want of prudence imputed to the Prince furnished them with an opportunity of attacking the throne by a side wind, they eagerly seized it, and, if we reckon the number of publications that appeared on the subject, made the most of the occasion. These writers certainly had a considerable influence on the public mind, and as the ostensible object of their publications was to shew, that the way best calculated for the preservation of the here-

ditary monarchy, was to prevent it from being oppressive to the people, though their real motive was very different, it was difficult to answer them in a way to meet the popular judgment.

The further consideration of the Prince of Wales's debts was resumed in the House of Commons on the 14th of May, when Mr. Hussey proposed that the reports of the commissioners on the state of the crown-lands should be referred to the present committee. He stated that, by the first of Anne, cap. 7, this subject, and that of provision for the royal family were closely connected. These lands, he said, had never yet produced 6000*l.* a year, though they might be improved to the annual value of 400,000*l.* The motion was, however, objected to, as not *proper* in the present stage of the proceeding, and irrelevant to the subject,

and was accordingly negatived; and the house proceeded to take into consideration the message from his majesty relative to the establishment of the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the liquidation of the debts of the Prince.

After an animated exordium, which few men were more capable of making on some occasions than Mr. Pitt, in which the immediate interest of the country, in supporting the dignity and splendour of the royal family, was strongly insisted upon by him, the minister proceeded to state the necessity of an additional establishment on account of the marriage of the Prince, and a jointure for her royal highness. These were the only objects, Mr. Pitt said, to which he wished at that time to direct the attention of the committee. The present income of the Prince of *Wales was 60,000l.* exclusive of the

duchy of Cornwall, which was about 15,000*l.* per annum. Fifty years ago, his grandfather, then Prince of Wales, possessed a net income of 100,000*l.* per annum, in addition to the duchy of Cornwall. Eighty years ago, his great grandfather, then Prince of Wales, had 100,000*l.* without that duchy. From a review of those establishments, Mr. Pitt said, the house would see that his present royal highness ought to have a considerable addition, even if he was not incumbered with debt. The difference of expence, between the former period and the present time, amounted, he thought, to at least one-fourth of the whole income. He therefore proposed that the income of his royal highness should be 125,000*l.* per annum, exclusive of the duchy of Cornwall. This was no more, he thought, than the committee would be disposed to allow to the Prince on the event of

a marriage which they approved and rejoiced in. Here, he said, he rested the present question; with regard to regulations to be made hereafter, he should state the preparations for the marriage at 27,000*l.* or 28,000*l.* for jewels and plate, and 26,000*l.* for furnishing Carlton House. The jointure of the Princess to be 50,000*l.* per annum. The debts of his royal highness, which were for future consideration, he stated at nearly 630,000*l.* up to the last quarter: besides which there were some debts in which he was security for the dukes of York and Clarence; but from their meritorious exertions, such debts were in such a train of liquidation, and a course of punctual discharge, that there was no fear of their becoming burthensome to the public. Mr. Pitt said, he wished to take the sense of the house on the best *mode of* freeing his royal highness

from his incumbrances, and was convinced, that, before the house should take any step for their liquidation, they ought to be clearly stated for accurate investigation; and for this purpose he wished to know whether the house would prefer a secret committee, which was the most expeditious mode, or whether they would leave the whole to be settled under legislative provisions. Whatever mode was adopted, it was necessary that regard should be had to a provision against contracting debts in future; and it was, he thought, necessary, that parliament should mark the sense they entertained of the manner in which his royal highness had incurred his present embarrassments; and in that view the liquidation of the debt might properly be a tax on the affluence of the Prince. He should, therefore, in a future stage of this *proceeding*, propose certain provisions

for liquidating the debts out of the duchy of Cornwall, and the other income of his royal highness, certain parts of which should be vested in commissioners, to discharge the debt and interest at four per cent. except such as bore legal interest at five. For this purpose he proposed 25,000*l.* a year should be set apart, which would discharge the debt in about twenty-seven years. In the case of the demise of the Prince of Wales within that time, 25,000*l.* would be charged annually on that succession; but in the event of the demise of the crown, and of his royal highness within that time, the burthen must fall on the consolidated fund. There were, he said, two heads to be attended to in the business under consideration — the punctual payment of the debt already contracted—and that no further debts should *be incurred.* For this purpose, no

arrear should, on any pretence, go beyond the quarter, that debts thus claimed should be punctually paid and no other. Mr. Pitt further proposed to invest Carlton House in the crown for ever, that the furniture should be considered as an heir-loom; and that all suits, for the recovery of debts from his royal highness, should lie against his officers. Mr. Pitt concluded with moving that the revenue of his royal highness the Prince of Wales should be increased to 125,000*l.* per annum.

Mr. (now earl) Grey and other members, opposed the motion on the popular grounds that as the community at large were suffering great privations on account of a burthensome and expensive war, that the Prince of Wales, having incurred debts to an enormous amount, ought not at such a *period to* have recourse to the public

purse for assistance, but make such a reduction in his expences as would enable him to discharge the claims of his creditors. However exalted his rank, he ought, they said, to endeavour to come to a composition with his creditors, which it was probable they would gladly accept; and that until he had satisfied their demands, until the calls of strict justice were completely answered, he should limit his expences, and abstain from the splendour of a court. Mr. Grey moved an amendment to Mr. Pitt's proposition, that the Prince of Wales should only have an augmentation to his income of 40,000*l.* per annum, instead of the sum of 65,000*l.* which the minister's proposition recommended.

Mr. Fox, in an admirable speech, took a luminous view of the question. He admitted, he said, the necessity of *supporting the* splendour of the crown

as an essential part of the constitution, but he did not understand calling it, as it had been called, the centre of the constitution. He did not regard the establishment of former Princes of Wales as the most creditable part of the history of the house of Brunswick. The establishment of George II. when Prince of Wales, had been a mere matter of party; still more so was that of his son, Frederick Prince of Wales. The establishment of the latter had been 60,000*l.* when he happened to differ from his majesty's ministers, and 100,000*l.* when he agreed with them. Mr. Fox delicately adverted to the suspicious circumstances in which such a transaction placed that Prince,*

* A particular account of the intrigues here alluded to, and certainly not very favourable to the character of Frederick Prince of Wales, or to the purity of his political advisers, is to be found in the Memoirs of Bubb Doddington, *Lord Melcombe*, who, it is well known, entered

and wished the house to avoid such a conduct as might expose the Prince of Wales to similar suspicions. He blamed the scantiness of the former income granted to his royal highness, and exculpated himself for having concurred in it on the ground of its having been an experiment, and that great deference was due to his majesty, who gave 50,000*l.* out of the civil list. A few years afterwards, other ministers advised his majesty to apply to parliament to exonerate the civil list from this allowance. In 1787, provision was made by parliament for paying the debts of his royal highness; and 10,000*l.* a year was added to his income. This he thought insufficient, but could not oppose it, after both his majesty and the Prince had declared that it was sufficient. The declaration of his

as largely as any man into the cabals of his day.

royal highness, that he would not again apply to parliament, had greatly surprised him; it was, however, a promise which, in honour, he thought him obliged to keep. It was, however, the opinion of ministers, that 60,000*l.* a year, in addition to the duchy of Cornwall, was sufficient for reinstating the Prince in all his splendour. Upon what principle then did they now say that 125,000*l.* a year was necessary? This, he thought, could not arise from his marriage—a circumstance which, whatever changes it made in the lower classes, very little altered the expences of those in superior life. How then could those who, in 1787, said 73,000*l.* a year was sufficient, say that 138,000*l.* must be necessary now? It seemed, that like his grandfather, ministers measured the extent of his allowance by the *degree of* approbation he bestowed

upon their measures. He was not actuated by the same motives, and therefore he should vote for the larger sum, provided that no similar application should be made to parliament in future. Mr. Fox then proceeded to vindicate the character of the Prince of Wales from some of the imputations that had been thrown out against it by preceding speakers. Was the Prince of Wales, he asked, the first example the house would select for reform, or, in some sort, for punishment? It would ill become him to be very pointed in his disapprobation of imprudent expences in others; but he would say to Westminster, to the public at large, "if you complain of increased habits of expence, begin the reformation by reforming yourselves." Considering the influence allowed to the crown, was it seemly to act harshly and austerely towards a Prince who had no

such influence? Something on this occasion might, he thought, have been spared out of the civil list. Queen Anne, from a civil list of 600,000*l.* gave 100,000*l.* towards the support of the war. George I. out of 700,000*l.* a year, gave 100,000*l.* for the establishment of his heirs; and George II. the same sum. In the American war, parliament paid a large debt for the civil list, and added to it 100,000*l.* a year. The sum for the privy purse had been gradually increased from 36,000*l.* to 60,000*l.* a year. Why should not the establishment of the Prince be proportionably increased? After the promise given in 1787, and that no engagement appeared on the part of his royal highness against future claims of the same nature, he was averse to noticing the debts. On account merely of the Princess of Wales, for whom the house, by its addresses, was pledged

to make a suitable provision, would he assent to relieving the Prince from his embarrassments, but not without a sinking fund for liquidating the debts within a reasonable time. The small sum proposed by the minister for liquidating his debts, the payment of which would take twenty-seven years, Mr. Fox thought only exposed the Prince to injurious reflections on the part of the public; relinquishing his state for the present, would leave a sum for the payment of his debts in a short time, at the end of which the public would gain a beloved and respected Prince of Wales, and his future years must be prosperous indeed, if he counted the years of his probation as the least happy of his life.

For this purpose Mr. Fox wished the Prince of Wales to give up 65,000*l.* a year, with the income of the duchy of Cornwall, for the dis-

charge of his debts. The sale of the duchy, he said, would effect this much sooner, and without expence to the public. He had been informed that it would sell for 800,000*l.* but he would state it at 600,000*l.* and the Prince's life interest in it at 300,000*l.* There would then only remain about 300,000*l.* of debt, which the fund he had mentioned would pay off in three or four years. Mr. Fox strongly recommended precautions for the prevention of future debts, provided they were applied to all future kings and princes; but thought there were inconveniences in making the officers of the Prince responsible for his debts, which could not be obviated.

After some further observations of Mr. Fox on the propriety of his majesty coming forward on such an occasion, and the right that the Prince had to the arrears of the duchy of Corn-

wall during his minority, and which had been applied by successive ministers in aid of the civil list, the house proceeded to divide upon Mr. Grey's amendment, when the numbers for it were 99, against it 260. On the division for repairing Carlton House, there were for it 248, against it 99. For the expence of the royal marriage 241, against it 100.

CHAPTER IV.

CONTINUATION OF THE SUBJECT—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRINCE TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—MR. PITT'S MOTION—ARGUMENTS OF THE OPPOSITION — SPEECHES OF MR. DUNDAS AND MR. FOX—STATEMENT OF THE PRINCE OF WALES'S DEBTS—SPEECHES OF MR. SHERIDAN—GENERAL SMITH—MR. FOX THE BILL PASSED.

THE debates in the House of Commons excited a corresponding sensation out of doors, which was artfully kept alive by inflammatory publications, and newspaper paragraphs, tending to degrade the Prince of Wales in the estimation of the public. In this state of the affair, Mr. Anstruther, then attorney general to the Prince, and since *chief justice* of the supreme court at

Calcutta, was authorised to make the following communication to the House of Commons, in the name of the Prince of Wales.

"That his royal highness was desirous to acquiesce in whatever might be the sentiments of the house both in respect to the future regulation of his expenditure, and the appropriation of any part of the income they might think fit to grant him, for the discharge of his debt; his wish, on the present occasion, was entirely to consult the wisdom of parliament. He was perfectly disposed to acquiesce in whatever abatement of splendour they might judge to be necessary from a view of his situation, and desired to have nothing but what the country might cordially be induced to think he ought to have. In fine, that his royal highness left all matters relative to *the regulation* of his establishment,

52118

and the payment of his debts, to the wisdom and discretion of parliament, with the assurance that whatever measures they might adopt would meet with his hearty concurrence."

Mr. Pitt, upon this occasion, congratulated the house on the constitutional sentiments which his royal highness had expressed, and said, he observed with pleasure, that a parliament which had never failed in any expression of loyalty to their sovereign, or attachment to his family, which had never been wanting in discovering a proper spirit of liberality, when the occasion called for it, had no less in the present instance shewn a degree of jealousy, care, and circumspection, when a demand was made upon the pockets of their constituents, attended with some circumstances which they could not altogether approve. He had *no less satisfaction*, he said, in observ-

ing that the illustrious personage himself was impressed with a just sense of that line of conduct, which regard to his character and situation required him to pursue, and he trusted that the house had that day received an earnest of the future disposition of his royal highness, and of that regard to the welfare of the people, which would distinguish him in the exalted situation to which he might one day be called. Under that impression, he hoped there would be little difference of opinion as to the proposition which he should submit to the house. The instruction he meant to move went precisely to the two objects which his honourable and learned friend (Mr. Anstruther) had referred to in the communication from his royal highness: the regulation of the expenditure of his household, and the appropriation of part of the income

for the discharge of his debts. It was certainly satisfactory, Mr. Pitt said, for the house to know, that his royal highness was perfectly disposed to concur in whatever arrangements the wisdom of parliament might adopt in respect to those two objects. He hoped, that by this communication every difficulty would be considerably lessened, though they might not perhaps be entirely removed, as some members, however, were disposed to support the dignity and credit of the Prince of Wales, by a proper establishment, had expressed their opinion, that no notice ought to be taken of the debts at all. The question, he would remark, at present, was not what part of the income should be appropriated to the payment of debt, nor did the instruction he meant to propose go so much as to narrow even the largest sum that *had been* suggested for that purpose.

The only question was, whether the aid of parliament ought to be given to his royal highness, by adopting legislative regulations for the discharge of debts, which it was admitted on all hands ought never to have been contracted. Without any retrospect to the past, over which, Mr. Pitt said, he wished to draw a veil, he appealed to the fair and candid feelings of the house, whether they could refuse to adopt a measure so necessary for the character and credit of his royal highness, so infinitely connected with his personal comfort and the splendour of his rank? Could they refuse to concur with his royal highness in appropriating a large part out of the income allotted him, in order to relieve him from the embarrassment of debt? The business appeared to him to rest upon so plain a proposition, and be in itself so self-evident, that, reserving all

particular details for future discussion, he trusted that what he had now to propose would meet the almost unanimous concurrence of the house. Mr. Pitt concluded with moving an instruction to the committee, that another committee should be appointed to bring in the bill relative to a general regulation of his royal highness's expenditure, and the appropriation of part of his income to the discharge of his debts.

The substance of the arguments of those who opposed Mr. Pitt's motion may be gathered from the speech of Mr. Duncombe (one of the members for York), who stated that he was one of those, who, on a former day, had voted for the smaller augmentation of the Prince's income. "At a time (said this gentleman) when the comforts and conveniences of life are wanting to the middling classes of society,

when the poor are scarcely supplied even with common necessaries, and when the prospect of a dearth* becomes every day more alarming, I cannot listen to the idle claims of splendour and magnificence; I trust that at such a season the feelings of his royal highness will dispose him rather to sympathize with the distress of the lower orders, and to sacrifice something for their relief, than to form selfish and extravagant pretensions. There is another consideration which deserves to be attended to. In these distempered times, let us beware how, by an unnecessary or wanton profusion of the public money, we furnish the favourers of wild and dangerous innovations with a colour and plausibility for their arguments. As a friend to the here-

* The harvest of 1795 was at this period very unpromising, and afterwards turned out extremely unfavourable.

ditary monarchy, as an adherent to the family on the throne, I feel myself called upon to resist the motion. Let us, recollect that there are other branches of the royal family. If, after the assurance we have received, we again consent to pay the debts of his royal highness, we shall establish a precedent, of which we cannot tell to what purpose it may be applied, or to what extent it may be carried. I do not mean to say that the debts ought not to be paid, but I look to other resources for that purpose. I look first to the justice of his royal highness to make provision for the payment of those debts that shall be proved to be just; many of them I apprehend do not come under that description. I look to his future economy in the regulation of his household; and lastly, I look to the assistance he may derive from the well known munificence

of his royal father. As the idea of temporary retirement has been suggested, I have only to remark, that from such a retirement his royal highness might reap great advantage in settling his affairs, and be again enabled to emerge with fresh splendour. Retirement, it has been remarked, is the nurse of reflection; by its influence his royal highness might be enabled to confirm those resolutions which he has expressed in his communication to the house, and to return again into public life fortified against future error, and qualified for the important duties of that high station which he may one day be called to fill."

The allusion to assistance that might be expected from the King, was repeated by Mr. Curwen and other members, and commented on by Mr. Dundas, who said, he was surprized

at one resource which had been pointed out by some honourable gentlemen, in the affection and benevolence of his royal father. *(A cry of hear, hear, pervaded the house.)* That cry, Mr. Dundas said, he was confident could only proceed from a few voices, and by no means discovered the general feeling of the house on the subject. They had repeatedly had occasion to examine the situation of his majesty with respect to the civil list, particularly on occasion of granting establishments to the Duke of Clarence, and to the Duke of York on his marriage. They might recollect that on the arrangement formerly made with respect to the debts of his royal highness, part of that provision arose out of the liberality of his majesty. The civil list was indeed large, but was wholly appropriated to particular *services,* except the sum allotted for

his majesty's privy purse. The idea of such a resource arose out of the miserable feeling which he was surprised that any gentleman could entertain. He knew not (and his means of information were as good as those of any other member) of the existence of any such sum, as that which had been referred to. Besides, he would ask, with that numerous family with which his majesty was blessed, were there no other objects who claimed his royal munificence and attention? The Prince of Wales was the last who might be supposed to have such a claim; he, from the situation in which he stood, was the peculiar care of the public. Allusion might be made to the revenues which his majesty derived from the electorate of Hanover. But had his majesty no state to support in that quarter? Was he to rob his Hanoverian subjects in order to pay

debts contracted in this country by the heir apparent to the British crown? The appeal that had been made on this subject he could consider as neither fair nor candid, and, as such, he should dismiss it without further observation.

These remarks of Mr. Dundas drew a most animated speech from Mr. Fox. That great statesman enlarged, in the most eloquent terms, upon the glorious opportunity afforded in the present instance for the display of royal munificence, and lamented that his majesty had not been advised to lead the way upon this occasion. He did not mean to say that the whole six hundred thousand pounds should be paid by his majesty; but he would say, because he felt, that it was a little unseemly at a time of such general calamity, his majesty should be the only person in the kingdom who did *not contribute* a single farthing towards

the discharge of the incumbrances of the Prince of Wales. This, he could not help repeating, was unseemly. He hoped his majesty would be better advised upon this subject. A glorious opportunity offered itself for the display of royal munificence; and handsome conduct upon such an occasion as this would do even more for the constitution than the most vigorous exertion of the arm of power. It was with this view he had contended, and sorry he was he had contended unsuccessfully, against the additional one hundred thousand pounds a year to the income of his majesty himself during the continuance of the American war, because, when all the subjects of his majesty felt so much during that war, he thought that his majesty would do well to shew them a lesson of frugality and economy. If this principle was correct, and the application of it just

at that time, how much more so was it now, when the question is—" How much burdens are to be laid upon the public to relieve the Prince of Wales from debt?" He would say again, it was unfortunate that some person had not advised his majesty to lead the way upon this occasion, to shew the public an example of liberality, and to convince them that he felt himself the necessity there was for indulging a generous temper. Happy should he be when this subject should come to be discussed, if the house, by a gracious communication, should be given to understand that the illustrious personage to whom he alluded intended to take some share in the contingent burden which might be felt.

On the 5th of June Mr. Pitt presented to the house of commons an account of the proceeds of the duchy of Cornwall, during the minority of the

Prince of Wales, an abstract of the debts which his royal highness had incurred, and an account of the application of 25,000*l.* for finishing Carlton-house. From these documents it appeared that the several sums paid from the revenues of the duchy of Cornwall during the minority of his royal highness the Prince of Wales amounted to 233,764*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.*

Debts on various securities and bearing interest	500,571	19	1
Amount of tradesmens' bills unpaid	86,745	0	0
Tradesmens' bills, and arrears of establishment from Oct. 10, 1794, to April 5, 1795 . .	52,573	5	3
£	639,890	4	4

Mr. Pitt then stated that it was his intention to move in the committee, that 65,000*l.* with the income of the duchy of Cornwall, should be set apart for the liquidation of the debts,

making an annual sum of 78,000*l*. The burden, he said, could not be thrown upon the civil list, which, in the event of the demise of the Prince, would be charged with the jointure of the Princess. He should therefore move, that the committee have a discretionary power to provide, out of the hereditary revenue of the crown (in case of the demise of his present majesty) during the life of his royal highness, for the payment of his debts; and, in case of the demise of the Prince, to provide out of the consolidated fund for the payment of such sums as should then remain unpaid. He explained, that for several reigns it had been thought proper to commute the hereditary revenue for a civil list. The mode he proposed was at once calculated to give security to the creditors, or, in the event of an accession to the throne, to render his royal highness responsible for the payment of his remaining debts.

One of the best speeches delivered at this interesting period, and which made the deepest impression on the public mind (if we except a speech subsequently delivered by his royal highness the Duke of Clarence) was that which Mr. Sheridan delivered on this evening. In the inflammatory publications of the day, Mr. Sheridan had, with peculiar virulence, been accused as one of the evil advisers of the Prince, from whose pernicious counsels the greater part of his embarrassments had flowed; but from this charge Mr. Sheridan vindicated himself so fully, that we cannot help feeling the utmost surprise, on looking over some recent publications, to find that Mr. Sheridan should still continue to be charged with being a prime agent in leading the Prince of Wales into his serious embarrassments. This distinguished orator opened his speech

with urging the propriety of ministers having suggested to his majesty the necessity of his setting an example on the present occasion. Were, he asked, the expences of the Prince so very unpardonable? His majesty possessed many great and good qualities; but on the subject of expence, and keeping his promise with the public, would the Prince lose by the comparison? In this he imputed all the blame to ministers. On his majesty's accession, the civil list was settled at 800,000*l.* a-year, which was thought so ample, that parliament was assured from the throne that the civil list should not be suffered to run into arrears: since then, debts of the civil list had been paid to an amount, which, at compound interest, would exceed seven millions. The chancellor of the exchequer had, in the early part of his administration, assured the house that no more debt

should accrue on the civil list, yet soon after called upon the house to pay a new debt.

Mr. Sheridan then adverted to the embarrassments felt by the Prince of Wales on account of the narrowness of the income which had been fixed for him, during which his royal highness had often done him the honour to consult him, chiefly because his royal highness knew his fixed determination to accept no favours; and Mr. Sheridan took that opportunity of declaring that he had never received so much as a picture or a horse from the prince. He had, he said, advised his royal highness not to make the promise he made in 1787, from the improbability of its being kept. He had at that time drawn up a plan of retrenchment, which was approved by the Prince, and by his majesty; and the Prince told him *the promise* was not to be insisted

upon, though, to his great surprise, he found it inserted in the king's message, which had been seen by his royal highness. The Prince wished him to retract it, but this he declined. Ministers had then a check upon the expenditure of his royal highness, which they had never enforced: they had never interposed to stop a shameful profusion of money upon Carlton-house. Under these embarrassments there was an attempt made to raise a loan for the Prince in foreign countries*, which, after a conversation with Lord Loughborough, was put a stop to, and the bonds burnt, though with considerable loss to the Prince.

* The loan here alluded to was for the sum of 3,600,000 guilders, and was attempted to be negociated at Antwerp, in the names of their royal highnesses the Prince of Wales and the Dukes of York and Clarence. The interest it was to bear was six per cent. and all the revenues and appendages of their royal highnesses were to be *vested in* the hands of the Dukes of Portland

Another plan of retrenchment followed, and the Prince was advised, Mr. Sheridan said, by Lord Thurlow and himself, not to apply again to parliament, and to take no part in politics, but to retire from public life, and apply the greatest part of his income to the liquidation of his debts. Another noble lord, however (Loughborough) having, about this time, obtained the Prince's notice, he, it seems, told his royal highness that such advice was too nearly allied to that given to Monsieur Egalité, and clearly pointed out the quarter from which it came. His lordship, though mistaken in his allusion, had that effect on his royal highness that his former resolution was superseded, and the present application made—an application which he ex-

and Northumberland, and of other trustees of the first distinction, for the due payment of interest and principal of the loan.

tremely condemned, and thought of a nature that tended to shake the very foundation of monarchy in this kingdom, more perhaps than any plan that the most inveterate Jacobin could have pursued.

The monarch, as far as was possible, was rendered unamiable, and the house insulted. The Prince was held up at once to scorn and reprehension, and at last obliged to live in splendid penury, to stand as it were, in a gilded pillory, and to do penance in an embroidered sheet, proclaimed to the world a wasteful prodigal, unfit to be entrusted with the management of his own affairs. Something, he said, ought to be given by the King. There were debts due to honest tradesmen, to whom no exception could be taken, which ought not to be postponed. There were, on the establishment, gentlemen

of honour, whose salaries were fourteen quarters in arrear.

Carlton House, being made the property of the public, the public, he thought, ought to pay the expence of rebuilding it. This would reduce the debts to 500,000*l.* The interest of this at five per cent. would be 25,000*l.* In 1777, the privy purse of the King was made 60,000*l.* a-year, and the Queen received 50,000*l.* for her establishment. He should therefore expect 10,000*l.* a-year from the privy purse, and 5000*l.* from the Queen's establishment; for the remaining 10,000*l.* a-year, he would look to places and sinecures, taking them as they fell, which in time would form a fund for paying off even the principal. Mr. Sheridan then proposed an amendment, that nothing should be charged upon the sinking fund, till it should be found that the resources he had indicated were insuf-

ficient.—On a division, Mr. Sheridan's amendment was negatived by a majority of 148 to 93.

On the motion of Mr. Pitt, the annual sum of 65,000*l.* was appropriated to the revenue of the Prince, out of the consolidated fund, by a majority of 93 against 68. A conversation then took place, respecting the appropriation of an annual sum out of the revenue of the Duchy of Cornwall, towards paying the debts of his royal highness, and whether the consent of the Duke of York was not necessary (which occasioned instructions to the committee for this purpose) during the time that his majesty, or his royal highness, shall be interested in that revenue. The commitment of the bill was opposed by Mr. Whitbread, as containing provisions degrading and disgraceful to the prince. Mr. Lambton (member *for Durham,* and who was in the con-

fidence of the Prince) stated, however, that his royal highness was perfectly satisfied with its principles, and in general approved its restrictions. Mr. Powys and Mr. Fox thought many points still remained to be discussed, before the subject was sufficiently matured for the decision of the house. What Mr. Fox particularly objected to was, that the income of the Prince would, he feared, be laid under the management and approbation of the minister.* He further objected to considering the furniture of Carlton House, as an heir-loom, as unfair to the Prince, and to his creditors. The

* The commissioners appointed under this bill for discharging the debts of his royal highness the Prince of Wales, were, the speaker of the House of Commons for the time being, the chancellor of the Exchequer, the master of the rolls, the master of his majesty's household, the accomptant general of the high Court of Chancery, and the surveyor general of the crown lands.

sale of the Duchy of Cornwall was again strongly recommended by several members, particularly by Mr. Sheridan, who opposed the commitment. The house, however, went into a committee, when it was moved, to allow the Prince of Wales 65,000*l.* per annum. Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. Whitbread moved an amendment, limiting the sum to 40,000*l.* which was negatived by a large majority. Another amendment was proposed by Sir W. Young, that the annuity should be paid out of the civil list: but upon the question for taking it out of the consolidated fund, the ayes were 149, noes 16: 27,000*l.* were also granted, on account of the marriage of his royal highness, and 27,000*l.* for finishing the repairs of Carlton House.

The arrears of the Duchy of Cornwall, *during* the minority of the Prince *of Wales,* which had been so frequently

adverted to in the preceding debates, were again made the subject of discussion by General Smith, on reading the report. He moved a clause for inquiry into the amount of the revenue during that time, with a view to its being applicable to the liquidation of his royal highness's debts. The attorney general admitted that he had been inaccurate on a former night, respecting the tenure of that duchy, which was of a nature so difficult and peculiar, that it was not easy for him to describe it. It was a fund set apart by the legislature for the support of the Prince of Wales, who had very properly been represented as *major de die nativitatis*. The right of the Prince was extremely difficult to ascertain; if it was a fund for his support from his birth, the King, as his guardian, had the disposal of the *fund during* his minority; and the long

period which had since occurred, would render any claim on the part of the Prince extremely doubtful. To this was added, by Mr. Pitt, that if any claim existed, it was on the part of the public. The revenue had been applied in aid of the civil list, and as such had been recognized by parliament. If this was a fund for the support of the state and dignity of the Prince, it was certainly intended that the appropriation of this fund should prevent any expence from falling on the civil list, or the public. Who would then have a right to set off against the income any expence incurred on account of the Prince? The expences of his education had been 80,000*l.* with an extraordinary expence of 3000*l.* this included the Duke of York: but as the same preceptors would have been necessary *for* the Prince, this made a trifling *addition.* In 1783, 60,000*l.* was

granted to defray the expences of his outset; in 1797, his debts were paid to the amount of 219,000*l*. These united made 300,000*l*. and would have to be deducted from the proceeds of his minority, should they be adjudged to him.

Mr. Fox controverted these arguments, and said, that with respect to the duchy being conceived the only fund necessary for the support of the Prince of Wales, that was far from being the case, since the principality of Wales, and the earldom of Chester, had been granted for the same purpose. Natural feeling, he said, required that the King, like other fathers, should be charged with the education of his son. The public had never given the King the Duchy of Cornwall; but the public indeed paid the King's debts, and they allowed the *arrears arising* out of Cornwall to go

in part to discharge them; if they had not, the amount of his majesty's debts would have been considerably greater; but was it to be asserted, that, be they what they might, they would have discharged them, or that, as a matter of course, they would have given 800,000*l.* with the same facility as 600,000*l.* Mr. Fox thought it of the utmost importance to ascertain what was really due to the Prince. The expence of his education, and that of the Duke of York, as appeared by a paper on the table, for a term of years, had been 40,000*l.* of which 25,000*l.* at most could be charged to the account of the Prince, though at the same time the revenue of the duchy was 75,000*l.* The 60,000*l.* voted in 1783, was not for the Prince, but in aid of the civil list, and of this, the *Prince* did not receive more than 20,000*l.* On a fair calculation, it

would be found, that his royal highness had not received more than 100,000*l.* above his regular income; and the revenue of the duchy during his minority, with interest, amounted to 500,000*l.* On a division, there appeared for the motion 40, against it 97.

A bill was then brought in by Sir W. Pulteney, for preventing any future princes of Wales from incurring debts, and passed; and the jointure of her royal highness the princess of Wales was fixed at 50,000*l.*

CHAPTER V.

PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRINCE—SPEECHES OF THE DUKE OF CLARENCE—OF THE EARL OF LAUDERDALE—LORD GRENVILLE—AND THE EARL OF MOIRA—RECAPITULATION OF THE DEBATES—EXAMINATION OF THE PRIVATE CONDUCT OF SOME OF THE ACCUSERS OF THE PRINCE OF WALES—VINDICATION OF HIS CONDUCT FROM THE ASPERSIONS OF A NORTH COUNTRY BANKER.

THE discussions in the lower house on this interesting subject were followed by a series of debates in the House of Peers equally animated, and, from the peculiar situation of some of the speakers, perhaps still more interesting to the public. On the first day's *debate*, the question of the Prince's

right to the proceeds of the Duchy of Cornwall was warmly agitated, and it was strenuously contended by them, that he was entitled to them from the day of his birth.

But the debate of most interest was that which occurred on the 24th of June, on the second reading of the bill, when a message was delivered by Lord Cholmondely from the Prince, similar to the former message delivered by Mr. Anstruther in the House of Commons, stating his royal highness's readiness to acquiesce in whatever measures the wisdom of parliament might think proper to recommend. The Duke of Clarence particularly distinguished himself on this day's debate, and in a speech, delivered under the evident impression of strong personal feeling, took a perspicuous view of the whole question.

His royal highness commenced his

speech with declaring, that having on a former occasion stated, that he should act in this business without any regard to party, he now rose to deliver his sentiments to the house, before an opportunity had been afforded to mingle personal feelings in the discussion. Whatever were his sentiments with respect to the bill whether he was satisfied with the whole, or only with parts of it, he should certainly vote that it might pass. His royal highness next made some observations on the title of the bill, and said he should principally confine his remarks on it to that which related to the provision to be made for the payment of his royal highness's creditors. There were some parts of the bill, which, he confessed, met with his entire approbation. It naturally and properly, his royal highness said, became an object to grant a suitable *establishment* to the Prince, on account

of his marriage. In granting this establishment, it might have been supposed that the Prince had now come at an age, at which he was fully capable of acting for himself, and would of his own accord have been disposed to take measures to free himself from any incumbrances which he might have contracted. But instead of this, instead of allowing him the merit and taking measures of his own accord, to pay his creditors, the authors of the bill had taken the popularity of such a step out of his hands. The other provision, which made the different officers of his royal highness's household responsible for the expences incurred under their several departments, he highly approved. He conceived it to be a measure extremely necessary for the dignity and comfort of every prince of Wales. A prince of Wales, his royal highness observed, by a particular law, became

of age at eighteen, while every other subject was not of age till twenty-one. A young man at that age, when the passions were at their height, and in his situation, might be led into expences beyond his income, and which, perhaps, might border on extravagance; but such a circumstance, he could not consider as a serious reflection on a young man of eighteen.

His royal highness next remarked, that these who had been most concerned in bringing forward the business, instead of acting as they ought, had so managed as to take away all popularity from the Prince, in order to centre it in themselves. The bill to prevent future princes of Wales from contracting debt, instead of going hand in hand with the present bill, the Duke of Clarence said, had been so brought in as to be attended with a *marked* personality to his royal high-

ness. Though he should not betray any thing that passed in private conversation, yet he could not help making some remarks on the manner in which the business had been introduced into parliament. It was a matter, his royal highness said, of public notoriety, that when the Prince of Wales's marriage was agreed upon, there was a stipulation that he should, in the event of that union, be exonerated from his debts. What could his royal highness understand by this stipulation, but that measures should be taken for the immediate exoneration of those debts—not, as by the provisions of the present bill, that they should be left hanging over for the space of nine years and a half, and perhaps, even a longer period. The authors of the bill had stated, that the credit and stability of the throne depended upon the support of the inde*pendence* and dignity of every branch

of the royal family, particularly of the Prince of Wales: was this the method they had taken as best calculated to support that dignity, and that independence? His royal highness had, indeed, expressed his acquiescence in whatever measures the wisdom of parliament might think proper to recommend; but what was the situation in which he was placed? The bill was in one point of view a public bill, as was every bill which related to any branch of the royal family; but it was more strictly a private bill, as nothing could be done without the consent of the Prince. Advantage then had been taken of the difficulties in which he was involved, in order to procure from him this consent. He was forced to express his acquiescence, in order that something might be done. He was in the situation of a man, who if he cannot *get a haunch* of venison, will rather

take any other haunch than go without.

The Duke of Clarence next alluded to the vast number of pamphlets which had been published, in order to influence the minds of the good and generous people of England against his royal brother. He knew persons in another place, he said, who possessed great powers of eloquence, and abundant choice of animated expressions. These persons had exerted their powers in order to support the measure of granting a subsidy of 200,000*l.* a-year to the King of Sardinia, a sum of 1,200,000*l.* to the King of Prussia, and lately the loan of 4,600,000*l.* to the Emperor. But though on these occasions they displayed all their stores of animated language, yet when they brought forward the situation of the Prince of Wales, they prefaced what they had to *propose with* the expressions—"an un-

pleasant task—an arduous undertaking —the distresses of the people in consequence of the war—the regret of laying additional burdens on the public;—" yet he must remark, that, if they had adopted with respect to his royal brother a language something more favourable, as to the impression it was calculated to give of his conduct to the country, they would not have had a vote less to the present bill.

His royal highness next touched on the situation of the Princess of Wales, a lovely and amiable woman torn from her family, for though her mother was the King's sister, she might still be said to be torn from her family by being removed from all her early connections; what must be her feelings from such circumstances attendant on her reception in a country where she had a right to expect every thing be*fitting her* high rank, and the exalted

station to which she was called? As a friend to the Prince he, however, would not oppose the passing of the present bill, for he was convinced that the sooner it passed, the sooner would its absurdity and malignity appear. If, as had been stated, the arrears of the duchy of Cornwall were due to the Prince during the period of his minority, he hoped that question would be quickly brought forward, and he trusted that the noble lord before whom it would come to be argued in his judicial capacity, and whose justice could not be impeached, would throw no impediment in the way of its speedy decision.

Lord Grenville replied to the observations of the Duke of Clarence, and moved the commitment of the bill. The Duke of Bedford said he would have opposed the bill, had not a message been brought down, stating his

royal highness's acquiescence to it. The bill itself he considered as highly objectionable, as it referred to two points, which were in themselves perfectly distinct. He certainly approved of the conduct of his majesty, in having stated in the message to parliament that his royal highness was much encumbered with debts. But the conduct which he thought ministers ought to have adopted was, either to have voted the necessary sum for his establishment, and left to himself to take the proper measures for satisfying his creditors, or have waited till such time as he had chosen to come forward, to request the assistance of parliament for the purpose of their liquidation. Considering the rise of all articles, he did not think an addition of 25,000*l.* above what had been granted to former princes of Wales, too much on the *present* occasion. But he was sur-

prised that ministers, who had formerly thought so much smaller a sum adequate for his establishment, should now think that the alteration in his circumstances required so large an addition as 75,000*l.* However disposed he might be to censure the extravagance of the Prince, he was not one of those who thought that it ought to be magnified into a crime. This style of asperity, he remarked, had been adopted by men, who wishing to go back to their constituents after throwing away millions of the public money in the prosecution of a war which they must at least admit to be unprofitable, were glad of an opportunity to claim some credit for their economy in the management of the national purse. They might say to their constituents, "Though we have spent your money in the prosecution of a war for the support of the throne, *do not* accuse us of profusion:

we have voted away several millions for that public object, but we have refused to grant even a few hundred thousands for the gratification of the heir apparent, for the stability of whose claims we are contending."

There were several circumstances, the Duke said, which tended to extenuate the conduct of the Prince. They ought to recollect his age, the station in which he was placed, and the insufficiency of his income to support the splendour necessary for his rank. He thought it would have been much better to have advanced a sum at once sufficient to have liquidated the debts. His royal father might have been expected to have contributed for that purpose. It was rather singular, that when in the course of one year they had granted a subsidy of 1,200,000*l.* to the King of Prussia, and a much *larger* sum in loan to the emperor, they

should now be disputing about advancing a few hundred thousand pounds to the Prince. His royal highness was certainly as good security as the emperor, for a sum so comparatively small. When ministers railed at the extravagance of the Prince, they forgot the examples of extravagance which had been given him in former times. Was his the only instance which had occurred of promises having been made to the public, and having afterwards been broken?* The same ministers who adopted this ungracious mode of conduct towards the Prince, if, at a future time, they saw him on the throne, would be disposed to pay the most implicit submission to his will, to contend

* His grace here alluded to the promises that were made from the throne, on the occasion of the first payment of the debts of the civil list, promises that were more than once broken afterwards, and subsequent application made to parliament for relief.

that all his measures were infallibly right, and to brand with the name of jacobins all those who might happen to be of a different opinion. This, he said, was not the way in which the monarchy of Great Britain ought to be supported.

The Earl of Lauderdale, another nobleman high in the confidence of the Prince of Wales, followed on the same side of the question. His lordship observed, that the sum which was to be granted to the Prince of Wales was by no means more than was necessary. It was not indeed so much as had been granted to his royal highness Frederick, the late Prince of Wales.—That Prince had been allowed an income of 100,000*l.* a year; and when the noble secretary of state came forward to propose the commitment of this bill, which was, among other purposes, to maintain the dignity of the

heir apparent to the throne, he would do well to consider the proportion of the sum now to be granted to his royal highness, and that which had been granted to Prince Frederick, as well as to consider what had been allowed to various other branches of the royal family for the last century; and, when that was done, he believed the sum now proposed to be granted to the Prince would by no means appear to be exorbitant; it would be so far from it, that it would appear unequal to what parliament had allowed before on many occasions out of the pockets of the public. He did not mean to say, that more should be granted than was now proposed; but he wished to take a view of it, as compared to other allowances made out of the public purse to branches of the royal family. There was to be allowed to his royal highness a sum of 125,000*l.* a-year.

Prince Frederick had 100,000*l.* Now, he would desire their lordships to compare the situation of the two princes. To do this, it would be necessary to consider the state of the revenue of the country at the time when Prince Frederick had this allowance, and the state of it now. There was a term which was, perhaps, more familiar to a French than an English ear, but which was, however, easily understood: he meant that of "direct and indirect taxes." At the time when Prince Frederick had his 100,000*l.* a-year, the indirect taxes were almost nothing when compared with the direct ones. The indirect taxes were those, which, being laid on the articles of life, which every one consumes, must necessarily fall on the consumer, and these were the only taxes to which the royal family were subject, for, by a clause which was *uniformly* inserted in bills that related

to their income, they were exempted from direct taxes. Since the time when Prince Frederick had this income, upwards of three millions of indirect taxes had been laid upon the public, consequently the present Prince of Wales must bear his share of them as well as every other individual. None of these fell on Prince Frederick; it followed therefore, by calculation, that the 125,000*l*. now allowed to his royal highness was inferior in reality to that which had been allowed to his grandfather in a similar rank. The noble secretary of state had, on a former occasion, expressed his regret that this measure was at all necessary. He regretted it also; but he regretted it too, that all the measures which were proposed to ameliorate the condition of his royal highness, did not go hand in hand. In the first place he must say, that in his opinion, much blame

rested upon ministers for this proceeding, and they had contrived, very unworthily, to load his royal highness with an unpopularity, which they could not have brought upon him, but by the means they had pursued in the progress of this proceeding.

The noble duke who had preceded him in the debate, had stated that they had given away the public money in loads and heaps for carrying on the war: to this he readily assented, for they had done so, and for what? Why, upon their own declarations, for the purpose chiefly of securing royalty in the country. In this declaration they might be able perhaps to make something up to their own consciences, for he knew not what was passing there; they would, however, find it difficult to satisfy the public upon that subject. But such was the avowed object. Now he should be

glad to know, how any member of the House of Commons, who voted for the war upon this principle of supporting royalty in this country, could tell him that he had any great objection to this allowance to the Prince of Wales, especially when it was recollected that 99,000*l.* was granted to the emigrants upon the cause of royalty. He could not conceive how men who did this should oppose this income to the Prince, or say they were discontented with it, unless they supposed there was some other quarter which it was more important for them to conciliate, perhaps more useful than that of pleasing their constituents. Ministers had acted very warily in this business; they had taken to themselves the credit of rescuing his royal highness from his embarrassments; and to pay his creditors, they were unwilling that he *should have* any of the management of

it himself, because they knew that in that case he would have the popularity of the measure, because the public would then see that the idea originated from him: but although ministers had thus acted, he, for one, must say, that while they pretended to provide for his dignity, they had done every thing in their power to lower him in the opinion of the public. Had they allowed him this income, and given to him the management of it, they would have given a much more solid foundation for the support of his dignity.

His lordship said, he did not now look whether the Prince had or had not been extravagant; the question now was, what he came to the public for? and upon this he must say that the Prince had been hardly dealt with in this business, and he should not have *been in* the least surprised, had the *demand* been greater upon his royal

highness than it really was. What had the Prince done to be censured as he had been? Was there any thing so very extraordinary in his present situation? What Prince, did we know, who had not, in his situation, come for a greater sum from the public? Persons at his time of life, and in his station, rather regulated their conduct with a reference to what they expect they will have, than by what they actually possess: and here it would not be improper to take a short view of what had been allowed to other branches of the royal family in this country. 500,000*l.* were paid for Queen Anne. George I. had 1,300,000*l.* extraordinary allowed him. George II. about 1,500,000*l.* and this at a time when the public revenue was less by millions than it is at present, and when the indirect taxes, all of which his present royal highness must

pay like any other individual, chiefly constitutes the difference. His royal highness had yet only received an extraordinary from the public of 261,000*l*. For his own part, his lordship said, he should not have been surprised if his royal highness had wanted a much larger sum than he did. It was not a case which he could affect to lament, particularly after his royal highness, having manifested a disposition to lessen his expences, was dissuaded from attempting it, and told that such an attempt would appear too much an imitation of M. Egalité! By this sort of catechism was his royal highness brought into his present situation, and he was sure that if the people of this country saw the matter in its real light, ministers would not be successful in their endeavours to bring odium on his royal highness; it would fall upon *ministers* themselves, who now affected

to feel such perfect acuteness, upon touching the public purse.

His lordship disapproved of the restrictions, as far as they were personal against his royal highness, but observed he should approve of them, if they were merely general to any Prince of Wales. He blamed ministers for not making those provisions, when the subject of the Prince's debts was before parliament on a former occasion, for he did not see why one message to parliament should be followed up with more restriction than another message. Ministers might ask, "how could they do it?" There were a thousand ways by which they could. They might have done it by the very means they adopted now, if they had been willing. It would require more ingenuity for them to convince the public that they should not then have done it than that they would not, for their

want of capacity was pretty evident. However, if they could not, they were the only persons who were in that situation. They had cherished the hopes of his royal highness, and now they attempted to degrade him; but he was not at all surprised at that, because it was perfectly correspondent with all their conduct towards his royal highness, and towards the public. He could enlarge more upon the subject, but the message delivered that day from his royal highness prevented him from opposing the principle of the bill.

The Duke of Clarence rose to observe, that when the loan abroad was proposed, on the part of his brother the Prince of Wales, he could positively say, that the secretary of state of this country prevented it from being carried into effect.

Lord Grenville warmly defended the

conduct of his majesty's servants. It was not, he said, the ordinary course of debating in that house, to charge the King's ministers with trying to degrade the son of the King, and the heir apparent to his throne. This was not an ordinary censure, and therefore he felt himself called upon to repel the attempt. What was the censure? And what were the arguments to support it? First, that ministers were the cause of these debts being contracted. They the cause of the debts being contracted? How so? Was there any man in the country who could lay his hand upon his heart and say so? At the time when the subject of the debts of his royal highness was before parliament on a former occasion, he had not the honour of holding any official situation under his majesty. He gave his opinion as a member of parliament only, and that opinion he

was now ready to maintain. Whatever the noble earl might think, he was of opinion that the whole of the income, now proposed, might be proper, although the former income might have been sufficient for his royal highness, the whole difference being between the state of a married and an unmarried prince.

The question of the precise amount to be granted, his lordship said, was one on which there must be a great diversity of opinions; and perhaps no two persons might exactly agree upon it. But how could it possibly be supposed, that ministers had endeavoured to attach any unpopularity on the Prince, by bringing the matter forward? But, it was said by the noble earl, that ministers endeavoured to degrade the Prince of Wales by the measure which they now brought forward. He would wish to ask,

whether the noble earl would not have said, and, indeed, with a better chance of succeeding with the public if he did, that ministers, if they refused to bring this subject forward, had attempted to disgrace his royal highness? So that the endeavour to assist the Prince of Wales was not now brought forward against ministers as an attempt to degrade him. He, on the contrary, trusted that their lordships and the public would feel that ministers had done every thing practicable to support the dignity of his royal highness.

Lord Grenville said, another point had been insisted upon with as little reason as the rest. It was contended that ministers were to blame for not bringing this business forward sooner, and to prevent the contracting of debts in future. What! before any application on the part of his royal

highness to discharge his incumbrances? What right had they? What power had they? What influence had they to do so? When the application was regularly made, they brought forward the best mode they were able, and were they therefore to be censured for submitting the whole of it to parliament? Indeed, if the noble earl blamed ministers for not coming forward on behalf of the Prince, without knowing that his royal highness wanted any of their assistance, to settle a mode for the payment of his debts, without knowing that he wished to adopt any, he must say that the blame was of a very extraordinary nature. There would have been very great indelicacy in such an officious conduct, and for which he had no doubt that the noble earl would have been ready enough to censure ministers for adopting it. His lordship then

observed that it did not become him to take upon himself the defence of members of the other house of parliament, to whom allusion had been made; from some of whom he differed, and some of them he knew to be pretty well able to defend themselves. They had granted large supplies for the prosecution of this just and necessary war. They had many of them expressed much unwillingness at the present measure. He knew no reason for saying that they were not actuated by a due sense of their public duty; and therefore, he for one, was not prepared to censure them for their conduct. The question before their lordships was not a question of attachment to any particular person, but a public question, on which every member of parliament ought to act according to his own idea of public duty. There were no doubt some persons who

wished to vilify his royal highness, and every branch of the royal family. Such persons were enemies to monarchy; but he was sure it was the object of ministers to keep the monarchy respectable and dignified, and he had no doubt but that such was the wish of the great mass of the people.

The Duke of Clarence observed, that the noble secretary of state (Lord Grenville) had stated that he was not a minister when the debts of the Prince of Wales were before parliament on a former occasion; but he must call to his recollection that he was minister in 1792. He now wanted to know, whether there was not a statement of facts on the incumbrances of the Prince of Wales at that time presented to a certain quarter. He knew there was, and therefore the noble secretary could not be ignorant of the affairs of the Prince at that period.

Lord Grenville, in reply, said, there could be no debate where there was no equality, and therefore he must decline any further contest on this part of the subject. He had stated what part he had taken as a member of parliament, and what officially occurred upon the subject now before the house. He did not apprehend it came within the scope of his official duty to state in that house any thing concerning an application made to another quarter.

The Earl of Moira, who possessed a large share of the confidence of the Prince, and whose character well justified the confidence which his royal highness reposed in him, now rose to state his opinion on the subject, and, in a manly and energetic speech, vindicated the conduct of the heir apparent. He contended that the provisions of the bill were equally inadequate and inapplicable to the purposes which it

held out, and maintained that, throughout the whole of the transaction, the Prince of Wales had been unfairly dealt with, in the manner in which his situation had been brought before the public. If a different conduct had been pursued, he was sure the public would have been as ready to come forward with assistance, as the Prince was uneasy that circumstances made it necessary for him to apply to them. Nothing could more strongly point out this, than the communication which had been made to parliament, setting out in language of heartfelt contrition the embarrassments he laboured under, and this, he conceived, ought to have been received more as a candid and manly acknowledgment of his real situation, then held out as an inference that he had been guilty of any criminal extravagance or idle waste of *money* not his own. He had always

been one of those who thought the Prince's income inadequate even to the current expences of his situation, and, therefore, he was the less surprised at his getting into debt. He differed entirely from the noble earl, who stated that his royal highness had regulated his conduct and expences by catechism set down to him, by which he was led to believe that whenever his debts amounted to a sum sufficiently large, he ought then, and not before, to make his situation known to parliament. By such advice he certainly might have been deceived, and encouraged to run heedlessly into expence; but he was sure that from no such catechism, and by no such advice, had his royal highness's conduct been dictated, and no man could have been more seriously affected than he was when he first knew the situation of his affairs; *in short,* his lordship thought

language by far too harsh had been applied to his conduct, when his fault really amounted to no more than this. He seemed ignorant of the old proverb, "that drop added to drop may become an ocean," and thus he had thoughtlessly involved himself in embarrassments much greater than he had any idea of.

His lordship deprecated the language and manner in which the business had been agitated in another place, and declared, that if he had been a member, he would have recollected that the subject was so nearly connected with one who was now Prince of Wales (the heir apparent of the crown), and who in the fullness of time was to be their sovereign: he would likewise have recollected, that not only as a Prince, but as a gentleman, the Prince's situation claimed *greater* respect than this bill shewed

to him ; it was a bill of that kind that he must have resisted in every possible way, and to have done so would have well become a British House of Commons, whose duty should have led them to treat the Prince with a manly liberality, and to bury his imprudence in a noble silence. It was the duty of parliament to support the dignity of the monarchy, which this bill so deeply encroached upon, and none could be more bound in duty to have acted otherwise, than those who brought it forward. But how unfairly have they acted by the Prince. They grant him 125,000*l.* per annum, but do they, or can they say, that it is granted for the purposes proposed and stated ? He had that day heard the message so graciously communicated by his royal highness through one of his household, which signified his acquiescence in whatever the wisdom of parliament

might recommend. Having heard this, and agreeing perfectly in all that had fallen from an illustrious duke (the Duke of Clarence), were the only reasons that could induce him to give any support or countenance to the bill. This acquiescence on the part of the Prince, arising from his respect for parliament and the public, was the sole ground upon which he could vote for it, because he was sure, and he knew the Prince thought, that no bill more inimical and contradictory to his interest could have been introduced even by his worst enemies. The Prince having paid such respect to the public, he trusted the public would not be defective in properly considering the hardship of his treatment, and that they would convince those who proposed this measure of their absurdity, and oblige them to remedy it in some shape *or* other, and he trusted parliament

would take an early opportunity of bringing the business forward. He then alluded to what had taken place in 1787. He well knew that the Prince could never do with the income then allotted to him. He acknowledged that the message had been read to him, but in a manner too lightly, and that the sort of promise then made was founded on an expectation that he was to have 100,000*l.* per annum, exclusive of the Duchy of Cornwall. On the subject of the arrears due to the Prince, he held the same opinion which he had stated on a former night, and he contended that the ministers had acted unfairly with the public as well as the Prince, and detracted from the credit which was due to the public. Had they been candid and manly in bringing facts, and facts only, before the public, they would have met the exigency most readily. They, how-

ever, had done otherwise, and there was nothing, he thought, so bad as that affectation of shame which ministers hold out upon mentioning any thing connected with this subject. His lordship warmly reprobated the calumnies which had been circulated against his royal highness, and the injurious pamphlets, teeming with abuse, which daily issued from the press. As a full refutation of them all, he stated how willing the Prince was that every particular of those debts should be publickly known;—to the commissioners every particular must be known. On the appointment of those commissioners, he must say by the way, that the Prince had been shamefully neglected: he had nothing to do with the appointment, nor was he at all consulted, which looked very like an insult on the part of ministers, whether they meant it so *or not*. It likewise gave them a sort

of influence amongst the creditors, which some time or other might appear at a Westminster election, as the commissioners would have it in their power to pay off the debentures of one set of creditors in preference to another, as it best suited their views. He declared that he did not mean now, or at any future stage of the bill, to move any alteration in it, because he trusted its absurdity was such, that parliament and the public would see the necessity of setting it aside. His lordship concluded with observing, that he did not think that this question could be entirely unconnected with party; but he differed widely from those who thought that the opposition and harshness used in both houses on this bill would give pleasure to the ear of a certain great personage. Certain he was that his royal highness glowed with every sen-

timent of affection, duty, and gratitude to his royal parents.

The Earl of Lauderdale replied: he contended that nothing had fallen from any of the noble lords that could be called a vindication of ministers. He had always thought that the Prince's income was inadequate; at the same time he never would agree to have it made so much a greater burthen upon the people for the purpose of paying his debts. He had always believed, and now he had heard from authority, the nature of the message in 1787, which was, that it did not come as an actual promise from the Prince, but as a measure which ministers thought politically convenient for themselves at the time; and they had persuaded his royal highness, against his own opinion, to agree to it. Promises of this sort had been made before. Here the noble

earl stated the first addition granted to the civil list in 1769, and that in 1777, when the speaker of the House of Commons had made a speech at their bar, which had justly merited and received the repeated thanks of both houses of parliament. His lordship next adverted to a new mode of reasoning which had been used that night: noble lords talked of supporting the bill, because its absurdity was so great, that the public must see the necessity of setting it aside. He was very sorry to hear such declarations in that house. He saw much censure attached to the ministers in the whole of this business; and was sure, if other men had been in power, and other men more naturally connected with his royal highness had given advice, such embarrassments never would have occurred; an ample revenue would have been first allowed the Prince, and then an additional in-

come upon his marriage, and all that would have been done by other ministers with credit to the Prince, and justice to the people. He begged leave to set the noble earl (Moira) who spoke last to rights, as to the supposed insinuation, that the opposition to the bill was to give pleasure to the ear of a certain illustrious personage: he would think himself a madman or a fool, had he said any such thing. What he said alluded to a very different quarter; and it must have been obvious he meant ministers, when he observed that he could not conceive any one would endeavour to degrade his royal highness, unless they knew it would please another quarter better than their constituents, and, perhaps, be more useful and profitable to them.

In a subsequent debate, Lord Moira repeated his former objections to the bill, and advanced some fresh argu-

ments to shew its unreasonableness. He put it to their lordships, whether it was proper that the Princess, after being invited over by the unanimous wish of the nation, under the idea of being made the partner and sharer of the splendour due to the rank she was to hold, should be sent into a retirement of nine years? If the measure of dignity and splendour necessary to the support of the character of the Prince of Wales could not be supported under the sum of 125,000*l.* per annum as declared by the bill, how could the Prince support it by so curtailed an income? If it was constitutionally necessary that such rank and appearance should be kept up by the Prince, it was acting contrary to the interests of the monarchy, and therein contrary to the interests of the country, which was attached to the interests of the monarchy, to make such arrangements as

would not permit him to support that dignity. His royal highness must draw the same inference; and every man in his closet, reasoning upon the subject, would, and must necessarily, draw the same conclusion. At the expiration of the nine years of retirement, where would be the difference of the situation of the Prince, as relative to the monarchy. If he could not support the becoming dignity as proposed during the nine years, at the expiration of that term he stood exactly in the same relative situation as he now did, and, according to this principle, all he received above the present proposed income would be a lavish waste of the public money. If, on the contrary, such arrangements were made as would disencumber his royal highness, he could take upon him to say, that from the disposition of his royal highness, *ll matters* might in future proceed to

the satisfaction of the nation. His lordship concluded with condemning the bill, as bearing the appearance of driving his royal highness into retirement, without even leaving him the grace of the measure.

Lord Thurlow, whose sentiments were entitled to particular respect, as well on account of his own high character, as on account of the fact which was well known, that he had been consulted both by the King and the Prince on the subject of his royal highness's embarrassments, declared, that he thought the Prince would acquire real and solid dignity by retirement; but at the same time, he did not think that principle should be pushed so far as to say that all splendour was unnecessary. On the contrary, the splendour which constitutions had thought proper to throw around their magistrates, *had an effect* upon the minds of the

public, and was one of the lines of attachment which existed between them,

Lord Loughborough (the lord chancellor), in a very able and eloquent speech, vindicated the character of the Prince. It had been supposed by some, his lordship said, that the debates on this subject had gone the length of attaching criminality to the magnitude of the debts; but he felt quite differently. He approved of the bill, because he thought the measure evinced a great deal of care and circumspection to the dignity of the Prince. It was a necessary consequence, that the action of personages of exalted rank should be remarked, and felt by mankind; and he conceived it arose from this principle, that they felt themselves interested in their conduct. From this connection—this kind of *union* between them—arose that cir-

cumstance of the peculiar attention paid to their actions. A private man in his actions might pass unnoticed, because they extended in their consequences only to himself; but not so with public characters. Those who stood in the exalted ranks of life must move in their conduct by other rules than those in the lower spheres. In them it would be low and paltry to count pounds, shillings, and pence, and to reckon with minute attention the expence of every article. If extravagance, or rather want of economy, was to be the consequence, it was excusable; if the contrary was the case, their very virtues might be turned against them; taste, liberality, generosity, benevolence, &c. were but so many incitements to error. Those mild virtues which adorned human nature, in such characters, would lead them into the devious path

of wrong. The artist exerted all his skill in the fabrication of various articles, which he presented to them for reward. Every thing was unfolded to their view, and every incitement stirred. And the more they possessed the above virtues, the more were they likely to act with incaution. The regulations, therefore, which prevented such incautious excesses, were not directed against the Prince,—they were guards which surrounded him, and prevented him from being liable to the incroachments such as he had represented. In such regulations the honour of the character felt no wound.

His lordship next defended the appointment of the commissioners, who, he said, were selected from high official situations, and persons perfectly conversant in business. In the manner in which these were appointed and the *debts* arranged, the house had shewn

how much they considered it as connected with themselves. It was a matter of great delicacy to put any confidential servant of the Prince in such a situation. It might be necessary to ask many questions in the adjustment of the debts, which a friend to the Prince would not like to do. Such a situation he thought best avoided, and the present appointment was such as must afford satisfaction.

This was the last debate of importance on the subject, and a few days afterwards (June 26, 1795) the bill received the royal assent by commission. A motion was made in the House of Commons for an inquiry into the Prince's claim to the proceeds of the duchy of Cornwall, during his minority, but not being supported, it was negatived without a division.

We cannot dismiss this subject without introducing an anecdote which

may serve to throw some light on the characters of some of the individuals who were most free in their censures on the conduct of the Prince of Wales. Far be it from us to condemn any man, in either House of Parliament, for the freedom of his language. It is the privilege of their station, and the spirit and essence of the constitution would be violated if it were suffered to be attacked. But we should be in a state of licentiousness, not of rational freedom, if it were permitted a member of the House of Commons to deliver a violent speech against an exalted personage at one period of his life, and afterwards not to be allowed to apply to that individual, when he ceased to be in parliament, some of those observations which he applied with so much asperity to his royal highness.

It is a curious fact, and no less

curious than true, that one of the persons in the House of Commons, who reflected most severely on the conduct of his royal highness the Prince of Wales, at this period, afterwards became a defaulter himself to an amount *full as great,* we believe, as that of his royal highness's debts, and *certainly* attended with far more individual misery and ruin (misery and ruin that subsist to the present hour), not to say a word of the national embarrassments it produced, and which shook the credit of the kingdom to its centre, than any extravagances the Prince of Wales ever committed, or the most bitter and malignant of his slanderers ever imputed to him. The person to whom we allude was, at the period of which we are speaking, a representative of one of the northern counties, and a provincial banker of first rate eminence. He was, besides, one of those

members who stand upon, what is called, the independent interest, and his sentiments were always heard in the house with the utmost attention. It cannot be doubted then, but that, when such a man stood up in his place in the House of Commons, and taxed the Prince of Wales with a violation of his promise, with indiscretion and profusion, with riot and luxury, and warned the house not to grant away the money of their constituents improvidently, that the sentiments of such a man were heard with attention, and produced a corresponding effect. His speech became a sort of text book for the pamphleteers of the day, and his constituents, though perhaps they did not formerly thank him, yet they individually approved of his conduct, and at a succeeding general election testified their approbation in a way most *honourable* and gratifying to a per-

son ambitious of a seat in parliament, by making his return certain. This much, it is but justice to the character of the individual alluded to, to say. —We admit, in its utmost latitude, the right of every member of parliament to canvass the conduct of the highest personages. But we beg our readers to mark the sequel of the history of the person who made more free, perhaps than any other, with the conduct of the Prince of Wales, when his royal highness's debts were under discussion. A few years after that period, his banking establishment, which was one of the first in England, and through its ramifications and credit was extended through all the counties north of the Humber, failed, and produced general distress wherever its notes were in circulation. We have heard the amount of the quantity of notes of this bank, or of

others depending upon it, which were in circulation at the time of its bankruptcy, and, if our recollection serves us right, it considerably exceeded the amount of the Prince of Wales's debts, to say not a word of securities which were lodged in this bank at the period of its stoppage. Here, then, we would ask a question, was the Prince of Wales's indiscretion in contracting debts to a large amount, or this private individual's inattention (to use the softest phrase) in permitting vast sums to be issued by his firm—sums which, if he had taken the trouble to inspect the books of his banking concern, he must have known that neither he nor his partners had adequate funds to answer, was guilty of the most culpable negligence? No question could arise, even if the argument of the Prince of Wales's ridiculous and impudent calumniator (Mr. Jeffereys)

were true, namely, that the Prince had been put in a state of bankruptcy, by the bill which provided for the liquidation of his debts, because a fund was assigned for the payment of all claims upon his royal highness, and the persons, who felt pressed for money, could carry their debentures to a ready money market. No question could arise (if we may compare great things with small, exalted personages with little), between the situation of the creditors of his royal highness, and those of the individual to whom we have alluded. The debts of the individual, who severely taxed the conduct of the Prince of Wales, were debts contracted for purposes of mercenary and sordid emolument. Gain was the object: risk was the means. The issues of paper from the banking house (in question) were far greater than *their funds* were adequate to pay, and

the result was, that the holders of their notes, who amounted to an immense number of individuals, were plunged into a state of the most pitiable distress. They had parted with their property for these notes upon the faith that they were equivalent to cash payments, and consequently they had demanded no advantages which a less secure mode of payment would have justified. Could the creditors of the Prince of Wales allege this? No! Unquestionably they did not look for ready money payment from his royal highness, and, like true tradesmen, they charged the Prince upon every article they furnished him with an advance equivalent, in their estimation, to the risk of the credit they gave.—It is an excellent apothegem of Swift, and one in daily practice, that "*an expert tradesman makes a few of his best customers answer* not only for those

whom he gets little or nothing by, but for those who run away or die in his debt."

Who can entertain the slightest doubt, but that in this way the majority of the creditors of the Prince of Wales secured themselves: but who for a moment can suppose that this was the conduct of the creditors of the individual who so bitterly arraigned his royal highness.

On the one part, there was an individual deeply conversant in commercial transactions, and, from his education and habits of life, was minutely acquainted with the mysteries of ledgers and day books; on the other there was a Prince to whom such affairs were almost wholly foreign. That the man of the comptoir should accuse the Prince need not astonish us: but that the same individual, a few *years afterwards*, should fall into the

same indiscretions (to say no worse of them), and should produce by his misconduct and the avarice of his partners an infinitely greater quantity of public and private unhappiness than any thoughtlessness of the Prince of Wales has ever given birth to, and should under such circumstances, and, with a full recollection of his former character of an accuser, and the impression which his accusation produced, be passed by unnoticed, requires, we must confess, a degree of forbearance which we do not feel ourselves in possession of.

The question which was most strongly urged against the Prince of Wales was, that, possessed of a very splendid income, he had not confined his expenditure within the bounds of that income. The next question was, his *promise* to parliament to regulate his *expences* so as they should not exceed

the bounds of his income. We have already shewn that this promise was not very fairly extorted from his royal highness. But let us now consider the difference of conduct between his royal highness, and that of one of his principal accusers in the House of Commons. His royal highness contracted his debts imprudently and improvidently enough we will allow, but the basest and most impudent of his accusers dare not venture to impeach him of any avaricious motives in their contraction. They were debts, to say the worst of them, of heedlessness and improvidence —debts which the liberality of the nation ought long since to have discharged! But the debts of the individual who so severely blamed the Prince of Wales were debts of a far different description. They were debts

contracted with the poor, the industrious, and the indigent, through the medium of a circulation of country bank notes, the credit of which rested almost solely on the character for good faith and integrity which the opponent, or rather the accuser of his royal highness had acquired!

Judge here, then, of the character of those who so severely arraigned the conduct of the Prince of Wales. Admitting his royal highness to have been guilty of imprudence, was he guilty of criminality or fraud? Was there more harm, or any deeper mischief attending the heir apparent's contracting a debt to the amount of 700,000*l.* divided, for by far the greatest part, among a number of wealthy individuals, whose charges, if they were paid, secured them from any loss that might arise from procrasti-

nation of payment, than in the conduct of a country banker, who, relying on the honesty of his partners, could permit them to issue sums to an unlimited amount in his name, after the warning voice of two stoppages of payment, and yet stand up in his place in the House of Commons to accuse the Prince. From the attacks of such an adversary would the Prince wish to be defended? —from the attacks of such a man would the most tenacious of his friends think it necessary to defend him? The Prince might plead his own improvidence, the carelessness or negligence of his servants, but such an apology would not be admitted on the part of the person to whom we have alluded. His mature years, his commercial habits, rendered him completely obnoxious to the rigid application of the law maxim, *qui facit per*

alteram, facit per se; he could not plead, who, on the hustings of the county which he then represented, had been objected to, on the score that an opulent landed interest would receive a severe disgrace if they submitted to the indignity of permitting a banker's clerk to represent them, that he was ignorant of the speculations of his partners. Yet such was the man who stood foremost among the accusers of the Prince of Wales.

On a review of the two cases, there can be no manner of doubt, but that the improvidence of the banker was attended with much more fatal consequences than it could ever be pretended flowed from any imputed extravagance of the Prince of Wales. The one impoverished a populous and industrious district of the kingdom, but who ever heard of the ruined creditors

of the Prince of Wales?* Here then seems to be the point at issue: the worst that the accusers of the Prince of Wales could allege against his royal highness was improvidence, by which a few mercenary individuals were disappointed in their hopes of extravagant gain: one of the prime accusers of the Prince of Wales, through the mismanagement of his commercial concerns, incurs debts to full as large an amount as his royal highness; and, while every epithet of reproach is lavished on the Prince, shall such a man pass uncensured?

From the multitude of libels that have at different times appeared against the Prince, it is impossible to

* We are aware that Mr. Jeffereys may be quoted against us in regard to this point, but we must observe that we do not consider Mr. Jeffereys as any authority, and we shall have occasion hereafter specifically to refute the calumnies of that gentleman.

notice each separate publication; some of them probably have escaped our search, and perhaps we have reason to congratulate ourselves on that score, for more vile and miserable effusions than the greater part of them, it has seldom been our misfortune to peruse: but we have paid that respectful attention to the proceedings of the two houses of parliament, whenever the interests of his royal highness were concerned, which became us to shew to the peers of the realm and to the representatives of the nation in parliament assembled; and this attention alone has drawn from us the preceding remarks on the conduct of an individual member of the House of Commons, who, according to our conceptions, censured the Prince unjustly, and whose own subsequent embarrassments were ten *thousand* times less worthy of indul-

gence than those of his royal highness.*

* The conduct of some of the members in both Houses of Parliament, who opposed the claims of the Prince of Wales upon this occasion, and who were not themselves very remarkable for the purity or correctness of their characters, reminds us of the old fable, that Jupiter had hung over every man's shoulders two satchels, of which one hung before, and contained the faults of his neighbours, and the other behind, which contained his own.

Non videmus id manticæ quod in tergo est.

CHAPTER VI.

BIRTH OF HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCESS CHARLOTTE OF WALES—CHRISTENING OF THE ROYAL INFANT—THE PRINCE REFUSES TO RECEIVE THE CONGRATULATIONS OF THE CITY OF LONDON ON THE OCCASION—CONFERENCE OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS WITH THE LORD MAYOR—SEPARATION OF THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES—OBJECTIONS TO THE INDELICACY WITH WHICH SOME WRITERS HAVE TREATED THE SUBJECT—MESSAGE TO PARLIAMENT RESPECTING AN INCREASE OF THE PRINCE'S INCOME—DEBATES THEREON—DISINTERESTED CONDUCT OF THE PRINCE.

On the 7th of January, 1796, being just nine calendar months, wanting one day, from her marriage, her royal highness the Princess of Wales was delivered of a princess at Carlton-house, between the hours of nine and *ten o'clock* in the morning. Conform-

ably to the etiquette observed on such occasions, his royal highness the Duke of Gloucester, his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord President of his majesty's council, his grace the Duke of Leeds, the Earl of Jersey, master of the horse to his royal highness the Prince of Wales, the right honourable Lord Thurlow, and the ladies of the Princess of Wales's bed-chamber, were present at the royal accouchment.

The royal infant was christened in the grand audience chamber at Carlton-house on the 16th of February, his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury performing the ceremony. The infant princess was named Charlotte Augusta. The sponsers were his Majesty, the Queen, and her royal highness the Princess Royal, proxy for her serene highness the Duchess of Brunswick.

Addresses of congratulation in the usual form were voted by both houses of parliament, and presented to their majesties, and to their royal highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, who received the two houses in a private manner. The corporation of the city of London, at the same time, voted an address of congratulation to their royal highnesses; but it being intimated to the lord mayor by Lord Cholmondeley, who was at the head of his royal highness's household, "that the Prince of Wales being under the necessity of reducing his establishment, he was precluded from receiving the addresses in a manner suitable to his situation;" and desiring that copies of the addresses might be sent to him, it was moved by Mr. deputy Birch, "That his royal highness the Prince of Wales having stated that the ina*dequacy* of his establishment preclud-

ed him from receiving the compliments of congratulation voted to be presented to their royal highnesses in a way suitable to his situation, this court are of opinion that they cannot, consistently with their own dignity, suffer the said compliments to be presented in any other way than the customary form." After some conversation, the motion was agreed to, and the remembrancer was ordered to convey a copy thereof to his royal highness.

At the next court of common-council, the lord mayor rose to state to the court the conference he had had with the Prince of Wales, on the subject of not receiving the congratulatory address of the city in the usual form, observing, that in a matter of so delicate a nature, he had thought it his duty to commit the purport of this conversation to writing, which, with the leave of the court, he would wish

to read. The communication was as follows:

"In consequence of a letter from Lord Cholmondeley, dated January the 31st, 1796, stating that his royal highness the Prince of Wales wished to speak to me at Carlton-house, and to give me a private audience on Tuesday (but which appointment was afterwards, by a second letter, fixed for Monday last, at one o'clock), I had the honour of waiting on his royal highness, who addressed me by saying, that he had seen with concern in the public papers a statement of what had passed in the court of common-council on Thursday last, respecting a letter written by Lord Cholmondeley, at the command of his royal highness, and sent to the city remembrancer, conveying his sentiments on the intended address of congratulation to their royal *highnesses*, which sentiments he con-

ceived had been mistaken or misunderstood, or at least a very different construction had been given to them than he meant, or was intended to be conveyed by that letter. His royal highness said that he thought it incumbent on him to preserve a consistent character; that as his establishment, for certain reasons, had been reduced, and that the necessary state appendages attached to the character and rank of the Prince of Wales did not in consequence exist, his royal highness conceived he could not receive an address in state, and particularly from the corporation of the city of London, for which he entertained the highest veneration and respect. His royal highness, therefore, thought it would appear disrespectful to the first body corporate in the kingdom to receive the members of it inconsistently with *their* character and his own dignity."

After this candid and manly explanation on the part of the Prince of Wales, we should have thought it impossible for any one to indulge in cavils on this subject; but such is the perverseness of some dispositions, that the most innocent, nay sometimes the most laudable actions of other's lives, furnish their malignity with food for detraction. This is strikingly exemplified in the conduct of an illiberal anonymous writer, who censures the Prince of Wales on this occasion with equal injustice and asperity. The Prince of Wales, from feelings of propriety, and a strong sense of his own dignity, declined receiving the address of the city of London in its corporate capacity. This, the writer whom we have alluded to, thinks proper to stigmatize as proceeding from spleen and ill humour, and calculated for no other *end than* to make the city of London

dissatisfied with his royal highness. We will put it to this gentleman himself—would it have been quite decorous for the Prince of Wales, then living on a retrenched scale of expence, with little more state than some of the opulent nobility of the land can and do assume, to have received the Lord Mayor of the City of London, arrayed in the city regalia, and attended by the Courts of Aldermen and Common Council, all habited in their state dresses, with as little ceremony as if they had been a deputation of his own tradesmen who waited upon him? So preposterous an idea could have never entered into the brains of any one, but a writer determined at all events, right or wrong, to find fault with the conduct of the Prince of Wales.

We have now to touch on a point, which from its extreme delicacy we *feel reluctant* to enter upon. Our

readers will immediately perceive that we allude to the unhappy separation, which, soon after the birth of the Princess Charlotte of Wales, took place between the royal parents of the illustrious infant. Various causes have been assigned for this separation; but none in our opinion by which it is satisfactorily accounted for. The idle conjectures of pamphleteers and newspaper paragraph writers are not deserving of a moments serious notice, and therefore we will not insult our readers, or debase our pages, by transcribing them. Indeed, if we were acquainted with the real cause, which we are free to confess we are not, we should think we would ill-consult the hononr and feelings of the illustrious personages concerned, by making it public. In such a case, the *public* may deplore, but they have *scarcely* a right to interfere. One of

the most serious evils that has arisen of late years from the unbounded licentiousness of the press, is the encouragement that has been given, by impunity, to professed libellers, to ransack the secrets of domestic life, and drag them before the tribunal of the public. The open noon-day actions of a man, by which the public welfare may be affected, are fair subjects of animadversion, but not what is strictly personal to himself, and concerns only his own domestic happiness and comfort.

Another objection too, we wish to make, is, the extreme freedom which some writers have indulged in when treating on this subject. Had it been the case between two individuals no ways peculiarly distinguished for their rank, a decent respect for the feelings of persons in such a state of estrangement and separation would, we *should* have thought, have impos-

ed some restraint upon their pens: but the high rank of the illustrious personages in question, instead of affording them any protection against the assaults of these literary bravoes, seems to have been an additional incitement to them, to whet their rancour and malice. We know of nothing more truly disgraceful in the whole compass of English literature, than the libellous publications which, from the year 1796, to the present times, have circulated with impunity against the Prince and Princess of Wales.

Dismissing this ungrateful subject for the present, and we sincerely wish we had not to recur to it again, we must proceed to the mention of some parliamentary proceedings in which the interest of his royal highness the Prince of Wales was concerned.

Shortly after the conclusion of the *peace of* Amiens, a gleam of prosperity

seeming to break over the political horizon, it became the wish of men of all parties that the Prince of Wales should be enabled, by the liberality of parliament, to resume the state and dignity due to his birth. A motion was accordingly made by Mr. Manners Sutton* (then solicitor general to the Prince of Wales), for a committee to inquire into the Prince's claim to the arrears of the duchy of Cornwall during his minority; but that mode of enabling his royal highness to resume his state being objected to by Mr. Addington, the Prince was recommended by his law advisers to present a petition of rights to the Lord Chancellor, by which means a judicial decision might be obtained on his claim.

The business was cut short in this

* Brother to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and now a peer of the realm by the title of Lord *Manners, and* Lord High Chancellor of Ireland.

stage by Mr. Addington, who delivered the following message from his majesty relative to a new arrangement of the affairs of his royal highness the Prince of Wales, viz. "His majesty having taken into consideration the period which has elapsed since the adoption of the arrangements which the wisdom of parliament thought necessary for removing the incumbrances upon the affairs of the Prince of Wales, and having adverted to the progress made in carrying them into effect, recommends the situation of the Prince to the attention of the House of Commons; and notwithstanding the reluctance and regret which his majesty must always feel in suggesting any additional burthens upon his people, he cannot but resort with confidence to the experienced liberality of his faithful commons, trusting that they will adopt such measures as are best calcu-

lated to promote the comfort, and support the dignity of so distinguished a branch of his royal house."

The message was taken into consideration on the 23rd of February, 1803, and Mr. Addington proposed that from the 5th of January, 1803, the establishment of his royal highness should stand upon the same footing that it stood in 1795; or, in other words, that it should be 125,000*l.* a year, exclusive of the revenues of the duchy of Cornwall. He did not wish for any change in the arrangements for the liquidation of the debts which were then formed, nor to have any of the checks on any impropriation of the sums received removed; he only wished that the Prince might be enabled to resume the splendour suitable to his rank in the state. The concluding part of the minister's speech on this subject is so excellent, that we feel

great pleasure in laying it before our readers.

"While I speak of supporting the splendour of his royal highness," said Mr. Addington, "I wish the idea I attach to this to be understood in a manner considerably different from those that are vulgarly entertained. The splendour of which I speak is not so much the exhibition of external show, as the means of commanding influence and insuring respect. I wish him to have the means of acting as a munificent patron of improvements, a protector of literary merit, an encourager of those plans of national amelioration, in which the present, above all former ages, is productive. I wish him to be in a situation to receive those attentions which all are eager to pay him, in a style agreeable to the loftiness of his sentiments and the refinement of *his* feelings. I am anxious to see him

forming with the nobility and gentry of the kingdom that connexion which ought to exist between the heir apparent and the most distinguished of those who will afterwards form the most illustrious branch of his subjects."

Mr. Manners Sutton expressed himself perfectly satisfied with the proposition of the minister, and said, that though at that time he had not the honour to be in his royal highness's service, he was authorized by the Prince to declare his earnest desire to testify in the strongest terms, the warmth of his gratitude to the sovereign, for the interest which his majesty had at all times taken in his welfare, an interest most powerfully marked in the measure which was now under the consideration of the house. As to the motion, he had been instructed by his royal highness to say, that he entertained a sanguine hope, not

unmixed, however, with a considerable portion of anxiety, that it would meet with the approbation of the house. He himself had, on more than one occasion, been empowered to declare to the house, the respect, the duty, and the gratitude, of his royal highness, for the kindness of his royal parent, and his readiness to renounce every claim, however well founded he might reckon it, rather than engage in any contest which might be construed into a violation of filial duty and affection. The house therefore would be able to form some idea how grateful their approbation of the motion would be to his feelings, as it would enable him to forward the course of fair justice and legal right, of which not the smallest reasonable doubt could be entertained.

Though he had no doubt of the legal *claims* of the Prince of Wales to the

arrears of the duchy of Cornwall, still he thought the agitation of the question might have led to the most unpleasant consequences, and involved in it effects earnestly to be deprecated. These consequences the message, and the motion founded on it, happily counteracted. The harmony which had hitherto subsisted between the sovereign and his eldest son had been preserved uninterrupted, and he sincerely prayed that the same harmony might prevail to the last period of life. As to the grounds on which the proposition now before the committee was brought forward, he thought it but fair, in justice to his right honourable friend (Mr. Addington) to declare that they were wholly of a public nature. Betwixt his royal highness and the right honourable gentleman there was no compromise of any description. When *this* proposition, as unexpected

gree of state and dignity with which the public at large, and the parliament, had expressed their wishes to see the heir apparent of the crown invested. These claims were not of a secret nature; the public were aware of them; it was therefore unnecessary to go into a discussion of them at present; but his royal highness thought it proper to have thus much stated, in order to avoid any imputation of unfairness on his part, of having, in the least, contributed to baulk the public expectation in seeing him immediately resume his full state and dignity. With respect to his royal highness's claims on the revenues of the duchy of Cornwall, from 1762 to 1783, he had, from the best legal advice, been satisfied with the validity of those claims, and accordingly instituted a suit for their recovery; but in consideration of his *majesty's* royal interposition, and the

liberal conduct of parliament, with respect to the present bill, added to other considerations, which, to the infinite honour of his royal highness, had made a due impression upon his mind, he had given directions to his law officers to drop the suit.

At this time, the following official communication from his royal highness the Prince of Wales was made to the House of Commons in his royal highness's name.—"That the Prince has felt, with the most sincere and affectionate gratitude, the gracious purpose of his majesty, in recommending his present situation to the consideration of Parliament. That having seen by the votes of the House of Commons, the manner in which they have received his majesty's recommendation, the Prince deems it incumbent on him to express his warmest acknowledgment of their liberality; at the same

time, the Prince, though fully convinced of the propriety of resuming his state, and greatly regretting any circumstance which tends to disappoint the wishes of his majesty, or of the house upon that subject, yet feels himself bound explicitly to declare, that there are still claims remaining upon his honour, and his justice, for the discharge of which he must continue to set apart, in trust, a large sinking fund, and consequently postpone, until the period of their liquidation, the resumption of that state and dignity, which, however essential to his rank and station, he knows from dear bought experience could not, under his present circumstances, be resumed without the risk of incurring new difficulties.—The Prince thinks that he owes it to himself, and to parliament, to make this declaration to them, with the same distinctness as he stated it to

his majesty's government, upon the first communication made to him of his majesty's benign intentions.—With respect to the Prince's claim to an account of the revenues which accrued from the duchy of Cornwall, from the year 1762 to 1783, however strong his confidence in the validity of his claim, a confidence fortified by the strongest legal authorities, yet he trusts that through the gracious interposition of his majesty, and the liberality of parliament, he shall be enabled otherwise to provide for those demands on his justice, which alone induced him to assert his right, he now cheerfully relinquishes suit, and has directed his law officers to forego all further proceedings."

END OF VOL. II.

B. CLARKE, Printer, Well-Street.

AUG 23 1950